



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-130
Monday
8 July 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-130

CONTENTS

8 July 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Tactical Nuclear Arms Control Issues Viewed [NOVOYE VREMYA No. 24] 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Bessmertnykh Discusses Dissolution of Warsaw Pact [Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 4 Jul] 3

Protocol Disbanding Warsaw Pact Published [IZVESTIYA 3 Jul] 3

Warsaw Pact Communique [IZVESTIYA 3 Jul] 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

PRAVDA Notes Ignatenko 2 July Briefing [3 Jul] 5

Background to London G-7 Meeting Viewed [PRAVDA 27 Jun] 5

Kovalev Meets North Atlantic Assembly Group [TASS] 6

State Bank Official on IMF Membership [INTERFAX] 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Sends Urgent Message to Gorbachev [IZVESTIYA 8 Jul] 7

Message Seen as 'Warning' [Moscow Russian TV] 7

Fitzwater Cited on Baker-Bessmertnykh Summit [TASS] 8

Democrats Oppose Western Aid to Union Government [INTERFAX] 8

Aeroflot Unable To Transport U.S. Aid [TRUD 2 Jul] 8

Prospects for G-7 Meeting Assessed [KABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 2 Jul] 8

Gorbachev Meets Canadian Businessman [TASS] 10

Tutwiler Statement on Vilnius Incident Cited [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun] 10

Northeast Asia

Primakov Holds Talks in Japan 10

Meets Kaifu [IZVESTIYA 6 Jul] 10

Comments on Japan, G-7 [Moscow Radio] 11

Kim Il-Song, Gorbachev on Treaty Jubilee [PRAVDA 6 Jul] 12

Commentary on 1961 DPRK Treaty [Moscow International] 12

MPR Envoy Notes 'Critical Time' in Relations [TASS] 13

'Mongolia Days' Open in Moscow [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun] 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Congratulates Vietnam's Do Muoi [TASS] 14

Shenin Accepts Some 'Blame' in Vietnam Ties [PRAVDA 29 Jun] 14

CPSU Greets Cambodian Party Anniversary [PRAVDA 28 Jun] 15

Bangkok Attitude Toward Phnom Penh Analyzed [Moscow International] 15

Soviet, Australian Firms Sign Technical Deal [Beijing XINHUA] 15

Near East & South Asia

Israeli 'Bullheadedness' Criticized [TASS] 16

Israeli Consul on Middle East Peace [INTERFAX] 16

Baku-Tel Aviv Air Link Agreement Signed [TASS] 17

Involvement in Iraqi Nuclear Program Denied [INTERFAX] 17

Egyptian Ambassador Gives Message For Gorbachev [TASS] 17

Foreign Ministry Watches Algerian Situation [INTERFAX] 18

East Europe

Reaction to Situation in Yugoslavia	18
Gorbachev Message to Markovic [TASS]	18
Gorbachev Sends Telegram to Mesic [Moscow TV]	18
Bessmertnykh Message Delivered [TASS]	18
Kvitsinskiy Visits Belgrade [TASS]	18
Kvitsinskiy Meets Markovic [TASS]	19
Kvitsinskiy Meets Mesic, Tudjman [TASS]	19
Markovic, Slovenia's Stanic Cited [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Jul]	19
Republic Presidents View Events [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Jul]	20
UN Association Issues Appeal [TASS]	20
Parallels Seen [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 6 Jul]	20
Causes Analyzed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Jul]	21
Resolution on Situation at CSCE [INTERFAX]	22
Gorbachev, Others Receive Albania's Islami [Tirana ATA]	23

West Europe

Kohl Arrives for Talks With Gorbachev	23
Preview of Talks [Moscow Radio]	23
Gorbachev Arrives, Agenda for Talks [Moscow Radio]	24
Gorbachev Welcomes Kohl to Kiev [TASS]	24
Ukrainians Heckle Gorbachev [Radio Rossii]	24
Talks Begin [INTERFAX]	25
Talks Continue [Moscow Radio]	25
Kohl Interviewed [Hamburg DPA]	25
Gorbachev, Kohl Hold News Conference [Moscow TV]	25
Gorbachev Departs [TASS]	29
Kohl Departs [TASS]	29
Kohl Post-Meeting Comments [TASS]	29

Latin America & Caribbean

Mexican President Previews Visit [TASS]	29
Gorbachev, Salinas Issue Joint Communique [Mexico City NOTIMEX]	29
Gorbachev, Salinas Give Dinner Speeches [PRAVDA 5 Jul]	30
Gorbachev-Salinas Talks, Results [PRAVDA 5 Jul]	34
Gorbachev Bids Goodbye To Mexican President [TASS]	34

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Fundamentals of Foreign Investment Law Adopted [Moscow Radio]	35
Lukyanov Unwilling To Discuss NKAO [Moscow TV]	35
Human Rights Acts Ratified [TASS]	35
Draft Law on Trademarks Approved [Moscow International]	35
Yazov, Ryzhkov Named in Privilege Report [Moscow Radio]	35
Draft Law on Political Prisoners Viewed [INTERFAX]	36
Experimental Penal Legislation Approved [TASS]	36
Supreme Soviet 3 July Session [Moscow TV]	37
Supreme Soviet 5 July Session [Moscow TV]	37
Supreme Soviet 6 July Session [Moscow TV]	38
TASS Rounds Up Session	38

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed on Contacts With West [Moscow TV]	39
Gorbachev Suspends Resolution To Resolve Conflict [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Jul]	40
Secretariat Urges Legislation on Economic Crime [TASS]	41
Party Official on Shevardnadze Investigation [TASS]	41

Democratic Reformist Group Statement Criticized [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jul]	41
Founding of Democratic Reform Movement Viewed [TASS]	42
Shevardnadze Cited on Reform Movement [Radio Rossii]	43
Cross-Spectrum Reconciliation Urged [MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]	44
Travkin Urges Unification of Democratic Forces [KOMMUNISTSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Jul]	45
Kasparov Organizing Liberal-Conservative Union [TASS]	46
Constitution Commission Favors Union Treaty [Moscow TV]	46
Prospect for Western Aid Discussed [MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]	46
Government Action To Aid Press Survival Urged [PRAVDA 29 Jun]	48
Editor on IZVESTIYA Office 'Conflicts' [MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]	48
TASS Reviews 6 July Press	49
TASS Reviews 8 July PRAVDA	50

Economic

Pavlov Sees Requisites for Economic Improvement [Moscow International]	50
Yavlinskiy, Primakov on Economic Reform Program [MOSCOW NEWS No. 24]	51
Ministry Releases Preliminary Budget Data [INTERFAX]	52
Republic Aides at Economics Ministry Meeting [IZVESTIYA 2 Jul]	52
Increase in Customs Tariffs Criticized [IZVESTIYA 1 Jul]	54
Formation of Military-Industrial Exchange Noted [TASS]	55
Private Shipping Company Founded in Novorossiysk [Moscow TV]	55
KGB Takes Part in Exposing Economic Crimes [INTERFAX]	55

Agricultural

Agriculture Minister Comments on Grain Harvest [Moscow International]	55
CIA Forecast Questioned [IZVESTIYA 5 Jul]	55
Military Assistance for Harvest Effort Eyed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]	56
Military Vehicles Dispatched for Harvest [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 28 Jun]	57
Aircraft Readied for Produce Delivery [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 29 Jun]	59
Military Region Harvest Preparations Reported [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jun]	59

Scientific

Academy of Technological Sciences Established [TASS]	59
Harvest Forecasting Experiment in Kursk [TASS]	60
Human Impact on Seismic Stability Debated [PRAVDA 2 Jul]	60

Military

Decree Boosts President's Influence on Army [IZVESTIYA 29 Jun]	61
Navy 'May Be Weakened' by Training Cuts [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jun]	62
Round Table on Foreign Threat, Persian Gulf [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]	63
Changes in Military Defense Industry Viewed [Moscow TV]	65

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Estonia

Ruutel Urges Non-Recognition of Baltic Annexation [Tallinn Radio]	66
Special Police Unit Created To Protect Borders [BALTFAX]	66

Latvia

Talks With USSR Remain Unscheduled [BALTFAX]	67
Government 'in Solidarity With' Slovenia [Riga Radio]	67
Deputies To Protect 'Security,' 'Independence' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jul]	67
Deadline Passes for Land Use Requests [Riga Radio]	67

Lithuania

Draft Economic Treaty Sent to Moscow [IZVESTIYA 6 Jul]	68
Statement on Role of Police Noted [Vilnius International]	68
Vagnorius Discusses Economic Reform [Radio Vilnius]	68

Vagnorius Cables Gorbachev on OMON Actions [Radio Vilnius]	69
OMON Said Supported by Conservatives [BALTFAX]	69
Unit Facing Disbandment [Radio Rossii]	70
Paper Views Vilnius Garrison Chief's Transfer [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Jul]	70
Groups Protest Law on Dismissing Officials [Radio Vilnius]	71
'Day of State' Holiday Observed for First Time [TASS]	71
Lithuanian Party Proposes Stability Measures [BALTFAX]	72

RSFSR

Polozkov Telephones TASS To Deny Resignation [TASS]	73
Silayev Statement on Clash With USSR Cabinet [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 6 Jul]	73
Pay Concession Halts Leningrad Dock Strike [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Jul]	73
5 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported [Moscow Russian TV]	74
Yeltsin Comments on Union Treaty [Moscow Russian TV]	74
Draft Union Treaty Approved [TASS]	76
6 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported [Moscow Russian TV]	76
Candidate Judges Nominated [TASS]	77
Yeltsin on Shevardnadze, Democratic Reform [INTERFAX]	77
Russian Communist Deputies Urge Leadership Change [TASS]	77
Yakovlev To Become Moscow City Assembly Chairman [Radio Rossii]	78
Leningrad TV Staff Leaving '600 Seconds' Program [Moscow Russian TV]	78
Sovetskiy Rayon Demands Recall of Deputy Baburin [Radio Rossii]	78
Tatar President on Union Treaty, Russian Ties [Moscow TV]	78
North Ossetian Congress Ends in Vladikavkaz [TASS]	79
Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Interviewed [Radio Rossii]	79

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

Kebich Criticizes Cabinet Resolution [PRAVDA 29 Jun]	82
--	----

Ukraine

Supreme Soviet Discusses Office of President [Kiev International]	83
Confrontation With Center Discussed [Kiev Radio]	84

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Speaks to Hungarian Journalist [SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 21 Jun]	85
Gamsakhurdia Views Control of Nuclear Arms [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 6 Jul]	88

Armenia

Presidium Discusses Army's Intentions [Yerevan International]	89
Army, OMON Operations in NKAO Reported [ARMENPRES]	89
Nagorno-Karabakh Appeals Army, OMON Actions [ARMENPRES]	90

Azerbaijan

Gorbachev Lifts Azerbaijan Emergency Decree [PRAVDA 5 Jul]	90
--	----

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Two Nuclear Tests on Semipalatinsk Schedule [Radio Rossii]	91
Semipalatinsk Facility To Close at Year's End [Moscow TV]	91

Uzbekistan

Trade Unions, Government Reach Agreement [TASS]	91
---	----

Turkmenistan

Agricultural Emergency Assistance Sought [TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 4 Jun]	91
---	----

Tactical Nuclear Arms Control Issues Viewed

PM0107081791 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA
in Russian No. 24, Jun 91 p 26-27

[Unattributed interview with Sergey Kortunov, consultant with USSR Foreign Ministry's Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration, under "Disarmament Problems" rubric; date and place not given: "In Search of a 'Third Zero.' Why Have Soviet-American Talks on Tactical Nuclear Arms Not Yet Started?"]

[Text] Sergey Kortunov, consultant with the USSR Foreign Ministry's Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration, replies to questions put to him by NOVOYE VREMYA.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Talks on tactical nuclear arms in Europe are the next step in Soviet-American relations. The prospect of these talks was welcomed in the Joint Declaration of 22 states 19 November 1990 in Paris. Mikhail Gorbachev said at the time that the USSR was ready to open talks one to two months after the signing of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The treaty has been signed, yet there is no indication of talks on tactical nuclear arms beginning...

[Kortunov] The United States is not ready. It claims that coordination of positions on the upcoming talks is still under way in NATO. The reason for this delay, in my opinion, lies not only in the complex and highly sensitive nature of the "negotiation material," but also in the fact that the West has of late been questioning the USSR's readiness strictly to observe the letter and the spirit of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. Until we restore the West's confidence, it is futile to hope for an early opening of the new talks.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Does this mean that the talks on tactical nuclear arms have lost their topicality?

[Kortunov] Until recently NATO countries were categorically rejecting the very idea of such talks and planning to modernize both the air and ground components of tactical nuclear arms. Now the situation has radically changed. NATO countries have come to the conclusion that the role of tactical nuclear arms has been substantially reduced in conditions of the new military-political situation on the continent, and have decided to eliminate all nuclear artillery shells on a reciprocal basis with the USSR after the opening of the talks. At present active elaboration of the positions at the upcoming talks is under way in NATO. And I have no doubt that the talks will open sooner or later.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] As the prospect of the new talks began to emerge, doubts about the need for these talks as such began to appear in military specialist circles both in the West and in the USSR.

[Kortunov] At first glance such doubts seem to be fully justified. After all, tactical nuclear arms cuts in Europe are essentially predetermined by the development of the political situation on the continent. The complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and

Germany will be accompanied by the withdrawal and subsequent reduction of Soviet tactical missile complexes, and also the elimination of nuclear munition dumps from these countries. The unification of Germany has rendered the preservation on FRG territory of battlefield nuclear weapons—nuclear artillery and the tactical missiles, and also the deployment there of the new Lance-2 missiles, impossible politically, and senseless from a military viewpoint. These missiles' respective ranges of 120 and up to 500 kilometers make it possible to use them for hitting targets located exclusively on the territory of East European countries. The elimination of the imbalances and asymmetries in conventional armed forces in Europe renders pointless the well-known NATO thesis that the NATO tactical nuclear potential is needed to compensate for the Warsaw Pact's "superiority" in conventional forces in Europe. In addition, insistence on keeping tactical nuclear arms in Europe intact in the new political conditions, not to mention plans for their modernization, would involve major political costs for the government of any European country.

At the same time most European countries evidently have an objective interest in enshrining these more or less predetermined cuts in a treaty. Furthermore, agreement can be reached at the talks not just about the withdrawal of tactical nuclear arms from Central Europe, for example, but also about their elimination. In addition, it is preferable to effect tactical nuclear arms cuts with monitoring rather than without it.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What is the Soviet Union's interest in these talks?

[Kortunov] Maximum nuclear arms cuts would be in keeping with the interests of ensuring stability on the continent and building a new system of all-European security. In addition, it would be desirable to enshrine NATO's abandonment of the deployment of the Lance-2 missiles in treaty form. A key element of modernization is now the TASM [Tactical Air-to-Surface Missile] program aimed at equipping NATO weapon-platform aircraft with the new guided SRAM-T [tactical short-range attack missile] with a range of up to 500 km both in its conventional and nuclear versions. Maximum limitation of this missile would be in the USSR's interests.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Is it possible to expect a revival of the well-known concept of a "third nuclear zero" in the runup to the talks?

[Kortunov] In the foreseeable future a "zero option" in tactical nuclear arms will continue to be unacceptable to most European NATO countries. They are interested in retaining a "minimum nuclear deterrence" potential to ensure the "transatlantic link" with the U.S. strategic nuclear forces. In turn, the United States is interested in retaining in Europe, albeit at a minimum, tactical nuclear systems to "provide cover" for the ground forces deployed there. NATO countries would like to use the talks to "legitimize" the "minimum nuclear deterrence" potential in Europe. At the upcoming talks the United States will, in all likelihood, lay stress on the complete elimination of the ground components of these arms in Europe while retaining and modernizing airborne systems.

The revival of the demand for an immediate "zero option" in tactical nuclear arms would, in all likelihood, not be in Soviet interests either, in the present conditions. Let us not forget that under the "third zero" NATO sea-launched tactical nuclear arms would be outside the framework of the talks.

It would be in the USSR's interests at the upcoming talks to seek radical cuts to reduce ground and airborne forces to a minimum level which would at the same time allow us to maintain the general nuclear balance in Europe. Aviation is the main element of the tactical "nuclear triad" capable of compensating for the tactical nuclear potential of the NATO naval forces in the European zone. Consequently, in this sphere the USSR's interests in respect of the topic of the future talks coincide with NATO interests up to a point. As for ground-launched tactical systems, including missile systems, they not only cannot in principle, by dint of their potential and deployment, counter NATO naval forces, this would also conflict with our pledge not to be the first to use nuclear arms. In conditions of actual military operations they can be used only in the early stages of a conflict, otherwise they fall into the hand of the attacking side even if it uses only conventional armed forces.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What will happen with the nuclear potential of "third" nuclear powers?

[Kortunov] It will probably be difficult for a long time to come to involve other nuclear powers in the talks. France, for example, views its short-range nuclear systems not as tactical systems, but as "prestrategic" systems (final warning systems). As a result of this, and also by dint of the fact that France is not a member of the NATO military organization, the French are stressing in every possible way that the tactical nuclear arms problem does not concern them. According to their logic, even after the elimination of the imbalances and asymmetries between the USSR and NATO in the sphere of conventional arms, France's need to possess "prestrategic systems" will persist. At the same time the achievement of a swift agreement on tactical nuclear arms without France's participation may affect the dynamics of its military building in this sphere, complicating its plans for the modernization of tactical nuclear arms (specifically the replacement of the Pluton missiles with Hades missiles), and, in the longer term, act as an incentive for joining the talks.

Bearing this in mind, the talks could be bilateral—Soviet-American—during the initial stage, as envisaged in the Paris Declaration of the 22 states. Other NATO nuclear powers, and possibly also countries possessing

"dual purpose" systems, could join them later. However, Britain and France would of course have to show restraint regarding their nuclear systems. As for China, its participation in the talks would be possible only at the stage when global decisions are elaborated.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] Will the concept of minimal nuclear deterrence be discussed at the talks?

[Kortunov] Unquestionably. The readiness, confirmed by the USSR president at the summit in Paris, to discuss at the level of nuclear powers' experts the concept of "minimal deterrence" and the level beyond which nuclear retaliation potential changes into attack potential, reflects the Soviet Union's determination to keep advancing in stages toward the elimination of tactical nuclear arms in Europe, bearing in mind the views of Western partners and avoiding dramatizing differences with NATO in the question of the role of nuclear arms in the cause of ensuring security.

As for the level of "minimal deterrence" which could be achieved as a result of the first stage of the cuts in tactical nuclear arms, it should not be viewed as some kind of a constant quantity. It will decrease in step with the radical cuts in conventional armed forces in Europe and with the solution of other disarmament problems, and will depend on the evolution of East-West relations in general.

[NOVOYE VREMYA] What about sea-launched tactical nuclear arms?

[Kortunov] If there are no cuts in sea-launched nuclear arms, the efforts in the other spheres of nuclear disarmament will most probably be devalued. This would create broad scope for an intensive "transfer" of military rivalry to this sphere of the nuclear arms race, and for "outflanking" future accords. Nuclear arms at sea are of great importance for the USSR in terms of deterrence. Despite this we have proposed to the United States to open separate talks on the phased reduction and elimination of nonstrategic sea-launched nuclear arms. During their first stage the question of the elimination of all such arms from surface vessels could be discussed.

At the same time a fundamental solution must be found to the question of nuclear-tipped long-range sea-launched cruise missiles, which should also be eliminated. Clearly this would result in the establishment of a "minimal nuclear deterrent" at sea.

I believe that nonstrategic nuclear arms can be completely eliminated in the future. Mutual deterrence can be entirely ensured by strategic forces alone. In my opinion, their possible minimum level is more likely to be determined by political rather than military considerations.

Bessmertnykh Discusses Dissolution of Warsaw Pact

AU0807080791 Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 4 Jul 91 p 4

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh by NOVOSTI reporter Vladimir Markov "for NEUES DEUTSCHLAND"; place and date not given: "Eastern Europe's New Start Toward a New Partnership"]

[Text] [Markov] The Warsaw Pact is history. How do you assess it today?

[Bessmertnykh] The Warsaw Pact played an important role in the years after 1955. It ensured the security of the countries that belonged to it. During its existence there was no international conflict, even though there were indeed chapters that cannot be accepted from today's point of view: 1956 in Hungary, 1968 in the CSSR.

The Warsaw Pact was that body which advocated disarmament in Europe with extremely important programs and proposals. If it had not existed, there would not have been any treaty on intermediate-range and short-range missiles. Thus it served the goals for which it was established.

[Markov] What will the relations of the USSR with the East European countries be like in the future?

[Bessmertnykh] Practically all participants in the concluding meeting in Prague stressed: A new chapter in our relations is beginning. The relations are to be built on a new political and legal basis and are promising in political, economic and other fields. The documents of Prague contain varied consultations on particularly important questions and the common striving for relations of partnership.

[Markov] Are there new aspects of the USSR's security?

[Bessmertnykh] The USSR's security will now cost less because it only has to protect its own borders and security interests, while the maintenance of the Warsaw Pact cost a lot of money. The all-European process has been moving in a good direction. New institutions are being established. We want to contribute to their development as well as we can. However, we will rely on our own strength and strengthen our own defense and security.

[Markov] Is there the danger of a destabilization of the situation in Europe, in view of the events in Yugoslavia and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact?

[Bessmertnykh] All measures are being taken to prevent that. The mechanisms established within the framework of the CSCE, which also serve as a damper in Yugoslavia, are beginning to have an effect. We assumed that Yugoslavia should preserve its unity and integrity. The Soviet leadership has had ongoing contact with the Yugoslav leadership and expressed willingness to contribute to the settlement of conflicts and normalization to the best of its ability. Regarding the potential effect of all-European mechanisms on the events in Yugoslavia, we stress that such an effect must in no way exceed the framework of the principles upon which the all-European documents are based.

Protocol Disbanding Warsaw Pact Published

CM0407123591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

["Protocol Ending the Validity of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Signed in Warsaw 14 May 1955 and of the Protocol Extending its Validity Signed in Warsaw 26 April 1985"]

[Text] The states which are contracting parties to the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance which was signed in Warsaw on 14 May, 1955.

—taking into consideration the profound changes which are taking place in Europe, and which mean an end to confrontation and the split in the continent;

—intending in view of the new situation to develop energetically relations among themselves on a bilateral and, depending on the degree of interest, a multilateral basis;

—noting the significance of the joint declaration of the 22 states which signed the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe and stated that they are no longer enemies, and will build new relations of partnership and cooperation;

—having decided to promote a gradual shift toward all-European security structures on the basis of agreements achieved at the Paris CSCE summit in November 1990;

—have agreed on the following:

Article 1

The Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed in Warsaw on 14 May 1955 (henceforth Warsaw Treaty), and the protocol on extending the validity of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed on 26 April 1985 in Warsaw cease to be valid on the day the current protocol comes into force.

Article 2

The parties to the current protocol state that they have no claims at all on each other's property as a result of the Warsaw Treaty.

Article 3

1. The current protocol is subject to ratification.

2. The original protocol and the documents of ratification will be kept by the government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic. The government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic will inform the other parties to the current protocol of the transfer of each document of ratification into safekeeping.

The protocol comes into force on the day the last ratification document is handed over for safekeeping to the depositary.

Made in Prague on 1 July 1991, in a single copy in Russian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, and Czech, with all texts being of equal validity. The government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic will transmit to all the other parties to the current protocol attested copies of the current protocol.

[Signed] For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, G.I. Yanayev,

vice president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;
For the Republic of Bulgaria,

Zhelyu Zhelev,

president of the Republic of Bulgaria;
For the Hungarian Republic,

Jozsef Antall,

prime minister of the Hungarian Republic;
For the Polish Republic,

Lech Walesa,

president of the Polish Republic;
For Romania,

Ion Iliescu,

president of Romania;
For the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic,

Vaclav Havel,

president of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

Warsaw Pact Communiqué

CM0407142191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

["Communiqué"]

[Text] A conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states took place on 1 July in Prague. Taking part in it were:

—for the Republic of Bulgaria: Zhelyu Zhelev, president of the Republic of Bulgaria; Dimitur Popov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria; Viktor Vulkov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the republic of Bulgaria;

—for the Hungarian Republic: Jozsef Antall, prime minister of the Hungarian Republic; Geza Jeszenszky, minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian Republic; Ferenc Somogyi, state secretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian Republic;

—for the Polish Republic: Lech Walesa, president of the Polish Republic; Jan Krzysztof Bielecki, chairman of

the Council of Minister of the Polish Republic; Krzysztof Skubiszewski, minister of foreign affairs of the Polish Republic;

—for Romania: Ion Iliescu, president of Romania; Petre Roman, prime minister of Romania; Adrian Nastase, minister of foreign affairs of Romania;

—for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: G.I. Yanayev, vice president of the USSR; A.A. Bessmertnykh, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR;

—from the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic: Vaclav Havel, CSFR president; Marian Calfa, CSFR premier; and Jiri Dienstbier, CSFR deputy premier and foreign minister.

The protocol ending the validity of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance signed in Warsaw 14 May 1955 and of the 26 April 1985 protocol extending the validity of the aforesaid treaty was signed at the conference. The document signed at the conference is subject to ratification.

The participants in the conference stated the following:

They agreed that the qualitatively new relations of good-neighborliness, partnership, mutual respect, and friendly cooperation between equal, sovereign states represented at the conference reflect the modern-day situation in Europe. Proceeding from this, they call for the development of ties in all spheres on a revitalized, bilateral, and legal-contractual basis.

They came out in favor of the further advancement of the all-European process in the interests of creating new structures of security and cooperation on the continent, in line with accords reached at the CSCE summit meeting in November 1990, and of the formation of an all-European framework for cooperation in the field of security, the economy, law, culture, ecology, and in the humanitarian sphere, as defined in the Paris Charter for a New Europe.

In the common view of the states represented at the conference, stability, well being and the further development of democracy based on respect for human rights and basic freedoms in the countries of eastern Europe correspond with the interests of all states participating in the CSCE process.

The participants in the conference established the readiness of their countries to hold, should they be interested, bilateral or multilateral "ad hoc" consultation on topical issues representing common interests, including on issues connected with the fulfillment of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe.

They confirmed the provisions of the statement by the Warsaw Pact member states adopted at the extraordinary conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest on 25 February 1991.

PRAVDA Notes Ignatenko 2 July Briefing

*PM0807132991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4*

[Unattributed report: "Presidential Assistant's Briefing"]

[Text] V.N. Ignatenko, assistant to the USSR president and head of the USSR presidential press service, began his meeting with journalists 2 July with a report on a conference in Moscow chaired by M.S. Gorbachev that day. Without going into details, he noted that representatives of all the republics were discussing the results of the country's socioeconomic development during the first half of this year.

The head of the USSR presidential press service recalled that next Friday morning M.S. Gorbachev is to leave for Kiev to meet with H. Kohl. This visit by the FRG federal chancellor will be a short working visit, but it is all, minute by minute, intended for businesslike, concrete talks concerning a broad range of questions both of bilateral relations and European processes, international policy as a whole, and, of course, the problems that will be the subject of discussion at the G-7 meeting in London.

Speaking about the Soviet head of state's preparations for his trip to Britain, the USSR presidential assistant noted that M.S. Gorbachev will meet G. Bush in London 17 July at the U.S. ambassador's residence. Needless to say, the coming meeting in London does not reduce the need for a meeting in Moscow and for full-scale Soviet-U.S. dialogue, the USSR presidential assistant added. It is thought, he clarified, that meeting will be held at the end of July, at any rate both presidents are now naming that as the time.

Answering journalists' questions, V.N. Ignatenko spoke about the USSR president's attitude toward the statement published regarding the creation of a democratic movement in the country. His first reaction was to single out the aims mentioned in the document. The head of state drew attention to the fact, the speaker continued, that the movement unites forces geared toward securing agreement in society, toward consolidation in the interests of perestroika and democracy. If all that coincides with its avowed aims, that can only be welcomed. At the same time the head of the presidential press service expressed support for the consensus group set up within the USSR Supreme Soviet pursuing similar aims.

Commenting on the content of the democratic movement's statement, V.N. Ignatenko stressed that the movement is not of a confrontational nature and does not operate as a faction within the CPSU, but invites all parties, groups, and movements to cooperate. By and large he assessed the movement's creation as a positive element.

The creation of this kind of movement came as no surprise to M.S. Gorbachev, the president's assistant said, since its

organizers spoke quite extensively about their plans. However, the president was unable to act as a consultant or adviser in this matter, V.N. Ignatenko said, rounding off this topic.

Background to London G-7 Meeting Viewed

*PM2806131791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5*

[Anatoliy Karpychev "Viewpoint": "Ahead of London"]

[Text] Without having yet taken place, the Group of 7 [G-7] meeting in London (15-17 July) has already caused so many upsurges of emotion and false rumors that considerable effort is needed to reach "fresh air" and grasp where common sense and good intentions lie and where there is—if you will excuse me—speculation.

The particular interest in the London round of talks has, of course, been sparked off by the invitation to M.S. Gorbachev. He will be meeting with G-7 participants who are, effectively, his long-standing interlocutors and partners: Bush, Mitterrand, Kohl, Mulroney, Andreotti, Kaifu. Major is the "new boy" among them.

Everything that has already happened around the London meeting and everything that will occur there is, in my view, worthy of the pen of a playwright. Starting with the idea of inviting M.S. Gorbachev. If you recall, they spent two weeks debating the matter. The press counted the votes: Mitterrand backed the invitation, Kaifu opposed, Bush kept politely silent. The next day Kaifu said "yes" and so on. At times it was hard to follow which position some leaders cleaved to. But that is by the by. In principle the USSR president's invitation means that an extremely important and promising step has been taken. Although I, for one, had no doubt that M.S. Gorbachev would go to London.

Why?

If you study the G-7 documents that PRAVDA publishes on this page you will draw the same conclusion. Within these documents there pulsates a clear tendency toward establishing contacts between our leadership and the "heavyweights' club."

Gorbachev waged a quiet "offensive" on the "seven" from Paris by sending Mitterrand a message that the latter read out to the participants in a meeting taking place in the French capital at the time. The "seven" did not resist the "offensive."

Then came Houston (United States). Once again the USSR president sent a businesslike message and once again it gave rise to tremendous debate. Certainly, there was talk of aid. What was the upshot? From Houston the "seven" welcomed our country's desire for economic dialogue. They instructed their specialists to study the situation in the Soviet Union and they spent six months on the job. It was decided to hear the conclusions at the next meeting, that is, in the British capital in 1991.

In my view, Houston was by and large the turning point in relations between the "seven" and the Soviet leadership. It heralded the start of what can conventionally be described as the beginning of dialogue between the USSR and the "heavyweights' club." Even the situation itself promoted dialogue. After all, the "seven" had met in the United States after a NATO session in London at which the "enemy image" was buried and the "cold war" "outlawed." By a happy coincidence London may once again have the honor of proclaiming new and extremely significant advances in East-West relations—this time in the economic sphere.

I am addressing the background to the next G-7 meeting in order to say: Everything has its own logic of development, its own causes and effects. You cannot establish economic dialogue all of a sudden. You won't tempt the "seven" to make advances all of a sudden. Especially since, due to the chaos and confusion, businessmen consider the Soviet Union a "zone of heightened risk."

It looks as though our domestic situation and domestic problems have become firmly interwoven with international affairs, with the Western business world's attitude toward us. A normal phenomenon in principle, that is how many states live—but as always this is not all a matter of course for us. We won't hide the fact from ourselves—since other people are aware of it—that we are as yet indifferent partners, unable to keep our word as the Russian merchants did. If you want to know, we have already ruined several Western partners over the last few years because of our slipshod work. And after that we want to join the world economy to the sound of fanfares?

It is not enough to want to do this. It is not pamphleteering articles presented as economic plans that are needed here or recriminations against the president that he is supposedly "kowtowing"—this has been put about on the one hand, while, on the other, it is being said that he is supposedly making bad use of his "historic opportunity." It is not "saviors of the nation" or promises that are needed here but the most serious work on the part of major politicians and competent specialists on both sides.

Certainly we have not been promised very much.... Here is the latest: Ahead of the London G-7 meeting finance ministers and leaders of the central banks have taken a cautious stance regarding aid for Gorbachev. How much cash will we get? I'm afraid we'll get nothing.

A difficult question arises: How are we to behave under these conditions? I believe that this question relates more to politics than economics. Indeed, all the preparations for Gorbachev's G-7 meeting also pertain to politics. There will be few surprises there since a strategy for behavior toward us is quite clearly discernible. We wish you success, but.... This "but" means many things, including gentle ultimatums. Will we be able to master this? The reciprocal movement is reassuring.

The reciprocal movement has played its role splendidly, but we cannot merely keep moving toward each other all the time. East and West must actually meet and there must invariably come a time for actions in tandem. The USSR president has described this as synchronizing efforts. The West has much to renounce here. Including stereotypes. Then the talents of scientists, economists, and wise men in general will be needed in unlimited quantity.

As for now.... Well, we will hope and prepare for very hard work. It is already under way here, in Moscow.

The G-7 meeting is not an auction, it is not a time for buying and selling. It will either be a fresh breakthrough or a halt en route.

We favor the former option.

Kovalev Meets North Atlantic Assembly Group

LD0607133491 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Kovalev received today a delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly, led by its Chairman Charles Rose.

The delegation is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet parliament. They exchanged views on a number of issues dealing with the situation in Europe, especially in the light of development prospects of the all-European process.

State Bank Official on IMF Membership

OW0107051191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1615 GMT 28 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A high-ranking official of the USSR State Bank did not rule out in an interview with IF [INTERFAX] that Moscow may soon officially apply for membership of the International Monetary Fund.

To the question as to what response was expected in Moscow he replied the IMF is to give a specific and unequivocal answer.

In his opinion, the IMF has no grave arguments against Soviet entry except, possibly, "purely political and far-fetched ones."

The most probable answer expected in Moscow is setting a transitional period for the Soviet Union to last about a year till it's ready to become a full-fledged member of the IMF and the World Bank, as IF has been informed at the State Bank.

United States & Canada

Bush Sends Urgent Message to Gorbachev

PM0807132591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Blinov: "Message from G. Bush"]

[Text] Washington—As has already been reported, U.S. President G. Bush has sent an urgent message to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. It was transmitted via J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador in Moscow. The verbal statement by the ambassador according to existing diplomatic practice presupposes that an informal note of the message's content has been handed to him. The U.S. press has merely reported that the message concerns the progress of Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic arms reduction.

On Saturday morning the U.S. President himself was in Kennebunkport (Maine), the resort where his out of town residence is situated. Secretary of State J. Baker spent the weekend with him.

G. Bush, who has resumed his sporting activities after his recent illness, ran his "standard" distance—two miles. Then he left for the golf course with J. Baker and his entourage. Television and press correspondents accredited to the President were able to ask him a few questions while he was playing.

"What does your message contain?"

"We simply demonstrated once again our interest in completing work on an agreement on strategic arms reduction.... The agreement should be completed before the summit meet, we hope by the end of July. And we are trying to push this process forward once again. Then Jim (J. Baker) and I will have an opportunity to talk to Gorbachev and his team at the summit of the 'seven,' where we will also have a one on one talk."

"What is the snag (at the talks)?"

"There are a number of technical questions. You know the general problems, that is question of the enciphering of telemetry, which need to be resolved, and extremely complex technical details. We are very interested in them, and I am sure that Gorbachev also knows that thanks to the frequent contacts between Jim (Baker) and Bessmertnykh. This is a priority question for the United States, and there are no changes here. We took a specific step forward a few days ago and now we are trying to complete this process."

"Why did you send him a verbal message?"

"We want him to push his team forward as fast as ours. That cannot happen without Gorbachev's personal participation.... I do not believe this is a question of procrastination. It is a question of rapprochement as regards

differences. I believe that he is very interested. We want to make sure that he is also hurrying on his bureaucracy, just as we are...."

ABC television has reported that in Kennebunkport J. Baker gave several additional explanations of what the President had said. According to the leader of U.S. diplomacy, Washington is not satisfied with the results of the recent round of talks in Geneva which ended last week.

So far the differences on a number of questions of the future strategic arms reduction agreement have not been successfully overcome in Geneva. These differences concern in particular not only the enciphering of telemetry for missiles which are being tested but also methods of monitoring enterprises for the production of strategic arms and problems of reducing the number of charges on multiple nuclear warheads.

J. Baker believes that the problem is that at the recent round of talks the Soviet side had insufficiently empowered representatives, who were unable to take the relevant decisions on the spot.

Neither B. Bush nor J. Baker has announced whether or not in his message the U.S. President suggested any compromises for unraveling the problems which the participants in the Geneva talks encountered. But they explained in unambiguous terms the main thesis of the message: For Washington the subject of arms control remains the priority in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations.

On the basis of these statements, the U.S. mass media note that the question of holding the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and its schedule depends directly on the results of the talks on the reduction of the two countries' strategic arsenals. U.S. commentators also voice the opinion that by his message G. Bush as it were predetermined the basic topic for his forthcoming personal talk with M.S. Gorbachev in London. It is then, they believe, that the question of the schedule for the next official Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will be decided.

Message Seen as 'Warning'

LD0707212891 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 2000 GMT 7 Jul 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] At his Camp David country retreat over the weekend, George Bush announced that he had sent a personal message to Gorbachev. In Bush's words, he called on the Soviet leader to speed up the progress of talks on reducing strategic weapons. What is curious is that the U.S. President described his letter to Gorbachev as normal diplomatic practice, while in the West the message has been seen as a warning that a summit can be held only after a Soviet-U.S. agreement has been worked out. Many observers believe that the Soviet military took advantage of Shevardnadze's departure to slow down the

process of talks on reducing strategic weapons. Be that as it may, President Bush was unambiguous in calling on Gorbachev to press his high-ranking bureaucrats to get a move on.

Let us recall that in London—where Gorbachev will evidently be off to at the end of next week—a working meeting is to be held on 17 July between the presidents of the USSR and the United States, at which they will probably be discussing all these problems.

Fitzwater Cited on Baker-Bessmertnykh Summit

*LD0807162391 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT
8 Jun 91*

[By TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov]

[Text] Washington July 8 TASS—A working meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will be held here on July 11-12, White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater announced today.

"President Gorbachev agreed with the president's view for the need to redouble efforts at reaching at start agreement and accepted the president's invitation to send a delegation to Washington to work on the negotiations," Fitzwater emphasised.

"President Bush welcomes this decision by President Gorbachev and hopes it can lead to further progress in the start negotiations," Fitzwater said.

Democrats Oppose Western Aid to Union Government

*OW0507141991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1230 GMT 4 Jul 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Consultative Council of the Democratic Congress, a body uniting democratic movements in 12 Union republics, explained in its letter to the U.S. President Bush its opinion concerning western aid to the USSR. The letter was handed over to U.S. Ambassador in Moscow Jack Matlock on July 4.

According to the leaders of the Democratic Congress, western aid to the Union government "will not improve the situation of this country's population and will not prevent the worsening of the economic crisis". "Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Pavlov intend to salvage the state system, not set the stage for the country's citizens to be self-reliant and show initiative," says the letter.

The Democratic Congress believes that western aid should come directly to democratic power structures in the Union republics and to the emerging business structures, bypassing the central government.

Aeroflot Unable To Transport U.S. Aid

*91UF0941A Moscow TRUD in Russian
2 Jul 91 p 4*

[Interview with Yu. Chuprynin, chief of the department of cargo transportation of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation, by A. Kopteva under the rubric "Mini-Interview": "Aid Is Not a Cause for Joy"; place and date of interview not given; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Moscow—The INTERFAX information agency has reported that for six months Aeroflot has been unable to transport a charitable cargo from the United States: seven tons of medical supplies and medical equipment collected by parishioners of the Catholic Church of the city of Anchorage.

We asked the Ministry of Civil Aviation to comment on this fact.

[Chuprynin] The absence of direct routes, as for example in this instance with Anchorage, the shortage of airplanes, and the overwork of the lines are the basic reasons for such delays. They say "over there it may be cheap, but it is expensive to transport it." The special price costs Aeroflot much more than usual—approximately \$5,000-\$7,000. There is another problem—the cargo is "lost" even before it gets here: Our representative flew to Anchorage and, to everyone's surprise, he did not find the cargo at the city's airport. Such lack of organization, the long distances involved, and the spontaneity of the charitable aid all complicate the delivery of cargo. It has reached the point that Aeroflot simply refuses to handle charitable cargoes...

[Kopteva] So the desire to do good creates new problems?

[Chuprynin] Unfortunately, in our difficult economic situation even charitable actions turn out to be fairly costly for our government. We can only sympathize and ask those who are preparing to render us aid in the future to turn to a specially created commission for humanitarian aid under the president of the USSR for consultations concerning the coordination of actions of foreign and Soviet partners.

Prospects for G-7 Meeting Assessed

*91UF0941B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 2 Jul 91 p 3*

[Article by I. Titov: "What To Expect From the 'Group of Seven'"]

[Text] I will acknowledge honestly that when I read in the press about the upcoming visit of M. Gorbachev to London for a meeting with the leaders of the "Group of Seven," I am struck by the straightforwardness and unpretentiousness of our propaganda.

People are calling upon the leaders of the leading industrial countries to demonstrate political wisdom and are arguing that if perestroika is not given immediate aid in the form of many billions in credits it will wither away. And, they say, that is not profitable for you, gentlemen. You see, you will have to spend the money on a new round of the cold war. Thus it is better to cough up the money now while it is to your advantage.

Such an "intellectual" assault is not quite honest. Fortunately President M. Gorbachev has publicly distanced himself from such propaganda. And he has done it fairly pointedly. This is understandable—they have simply "predetermined" him. They have depicted him as a petitioner who does not even consider it necessary to pronounce the word "please."

Incidentally the responsibility for this lies not only with the commentators, but also with those who have worked out the very idea of the participation of M. Gorbachev at the London meeting. Academically attractive, it quickly displayed a weak though practical suitability. I will try to refute this argument.

Let me start with the form. In other words, with the fact of turning the "group of seven" into a "group of eight" by means of including the USSR in it. The negative reaction to this proposal, in my opinion, was the result of a single consideration. What could a freshman who wished to take part in a graduation party of upper-classmen expect? After all, the "group of seven" is a club of industrial giants closed to outsiders. Where are you and I in that table of ranks? There is no need to remind us.

The refusal went out in a very correct fashion. The authority of M. Gorbachev is sufficiently great that the "group of seven" thought long and hard how not to offend him by its refusal. It finally decided to invite him to London for the meeting—but only after the completion of the official agenda of the "summit." The juggling of the schedule will not change the end result for the most part.

Now for the essence of the idea—concerning economic aid to the USSR on the part of the countries of the "group of seven." Theoretically everything is simple: While individually they either could not or did not wish to give us credits, they will together find the resolution and the opportunity.

Let us try to dig a little deeper. What is important here? First, are any of the "seven" in a condition to allot us aid. And, second, is there a desire or, more accurately, a stimulus to grant it to us.

The most powerful members of the "seven" are the United States, the FRG, and Japan. It is from them that we could in principle expect something. But the United States has no extra money. The Americans are constantly stressing that. The Persian crisis cost them a pretty penny. Even the \$1.5 billion which they decided to give us for the purchase of American grain will be allotted in

portions because of a limitation of loan capital. Nor will there be free capital in the United States next year either. They can increase taxes or cut domestic programs. But that is unrealistic. According to public opinion polls, about two-thirds of Americans are against granting us even several billion dollars.

There is one more consideration. Very recently the U.S. House of Representatives passed a draft bill on foreign aid for 1992-1993. The largest recipients of American aid—and that is \$25.4 billion—will be Israel and Egypt. This draft bill promises us only "technical assistance." In addition, according to an amendment that was passed, aid to the central government is prohibited—it may only go to the republics, and to the Baltic republics first and foremost. There is not much room for hope there.

What about the FRG? After the many billions in aid for withdrawing Soviet troops from the former GDR next year, Germany's balance of payments will be in a very poor state. In addition, it has on its hands its poor stepchild, the eastern lands. In other words, it has more than enough of its own problems. Over the short term it will not be able to play "first violin" in assistance to the Soviet Union.

Japan could play that role brilliantly. This year it will have a positive balance of payments—approximately \$41 billion. But, alas, it is decidedly against granting aid. It should not be blamed: It has its own reasons. Among them is the territorial problem (which is the most obvious although not the most basic problem). It is clear that T. Kaifu, the prime minister of Japan, will draw the attention of the "seven" to it if the question of economic aid to the USSR is raised in London. Japan justifiably fears that the six leaders of the Western world will point their fingers at him and say that it is up to Japan to pay.

Indeed it was Japan who insisted that M. Gorbachev not be invited to London as an official participant of the "summit" and who demanded that the question of financial aid to the USSR not be included in the agenda of the meeting. There is no need for comment, as they say.

Nonetheless, the "seven" should not be accused of "political shortsightedness": Money is never handed out anywhere just for good looks. Even the Marshall plan for the FRG and Japan, which our economists like to cite so much, pursued strategic aims first and foremost and dictated the logic of the antagonism of the two systems. In other words, it was dictated by political motives. The grain credit for \$1.5 billion is for economic profit. The money will go to American farmers.

Incidentally there is no need to be horrified that credits have conditions attached: If we take the money, we must also accept the conditions. That is natural. In the meantime, our "trick" of placing construction orders with Turkey using FRG credits will have repercussions: We save a kopek and we lose a ruble. Because we set our potential creditors on their guard.

There is one more significant question which naturally troubles them—our ability to repay debts. Until now we have managed in one fashion or another. However American experts, commissioned by G. Bush, have again studied the creditworthiness of the Soviet Union. And for good reason, of course.

Now about politics. Naturally the countries of the "group of seven" want to see in us a stable, healthy member of the world community. But it is extremely naive to suppose that they are prepared to throw us 100-200 billion dollars in order to avert chaos and anarchy on one-sixth of the world beyond their own national borders. After all, their chief interest is their own security. Everything else falls by the wayside.

In the opinion of many foreign strategists, we do not present a military threat inasmuch as we are no longer able to conduct a modern war. We do not have the economic means. So ask yourself whether the West is prepared to assist us with billions, particularly in loans that are not backed by anything. The thing that really alarms them is the problem of the refugees who will pour into Western Europe by the millions if the situation in our country deteriorates even more. In this there is something for us to consider. But another question arises: How useful will that kind of aid be to us?

In short, the issue can be discussed endlessly. But it is interesting to know one thing: What should we expect from the "group of seven"? I believe that they can allot us capital through the International Monetary Fund and other international financial organizations. The United States will grant us most favored nation status and remove trade restrictions. The "seven" will render technical and intellectual assistance. It is possible that debts will be postponed and a group of experts will be created that will discuss how to help us.

We also should consider what to do so that the political interests of the West will coincide with its economic interests and find realization in a desire for cooperation and investment in the Soviet economy. Should we attract the West with our natural resources? That is possible. But it is better to wait—with time their price will grow. Cooperation in the area of the conversion of the defense industry has the most realistic prospects. Here even the restrained Japanese are showing interest. And this is understandable: It kills two birds with one stone.

Perhaps it is even worth giving away, under concession or even entirely, defense enterprises that are standing idle. Perhaps we should not dogmatically shy away from the conditions which the countries of the "group of seven" tie to their aid. Particularly inasmuch as we have no other means of gaining their interest, whether we like it or not. Absolutely no other means.

If, of course, we really do need the aid...

Gorbachev Meets Canadian Businessman

LD0107180191 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT
1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev today received prominent Canadian businessman Albert Reichmann.

His company is finishing work with Soviet partners on a major oil project on the territory of the Komi Soviet Socialist Republic.

The project provides for using high technology and is likely to produce profits in near future.

Tutwiler Statement on Vilnius Incident Cited

PM2806154891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from IZVESTIYA and news agencies roundup: "On the Incident in Vilnius"]

[Text] U.S. State Department spokesperson M. Tutwiler stated in connection with the incident at the Vilnius intercity telephone station: "This new use of military force in Lithuania does not help to create an atmosphere in which talks could take place in a spirit of goodwill between the USSR and the Baltic republics. We are conveying to the Soviet authorities our serious concern over this incident involving the Soviet 'black berets.' We have instructed our embassy to contact the Soviet Foreign Ministry in order once again to point out that in our opinion the Baltic problem can only be resolved through peaceful dialogue and talks. We have told the Soviet Union before about our serious concern over the continuing use of force in the Baltic. The reasons for the Vilnius incident are not yet entirely clear to us, but we still believe that intimidation and the use of force will only complicate the problems, and not solve them."

Northeast Asia

Primakov Holds Talks in Japan

Meets Kaifu

PM0507205091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kolnov: "Ye. Primakov Meets With Japanese Prime Minister"]

[Text] Tokyo, 4 Jul—Japan is in favor of the continuation of the process of perestroika and reform of the Soviet economy, and will proceed on that basis in defining its position in relations with the USSR. So said Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu at a meeting with Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, member of the USSR Security Council, who arrived in Tokyo today for a brief visit on the instructions of the USSR president.

During the talk, at which Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama and Lyudvig Chizhov, USSR ambassador to Japan, were also present, there was a thorough exchange of opinions on questions relating to the upcoming London conference of heads of state and government of the seven biggest industrial countries and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's participation. As Toshiki Kaifu said, although Japan is prepared to help perestroika, its success will depend largely on the Soviet Union's own efforts. At present, he went on, the government is studying the question of precisely what technical and intellectual assistance by the Japanese side will be most effective in supporting those efforts. However, unfortunately it is not yet entirely clear what means the USSR will choose to achieve its goals. On the other hand, the prime minister said, in considering the potential for assisting the process of reforms in the Soviet Union, Japan expects its "policy of new thinking" to acquire a global nature.

During the talk, touching on the question of what plan for economic reforms will be presented by Mikhail Gorbachev at the meeting with the participants in the London conference, Yevgeniy Primakov noted that there are many points of contact between the government draft and the draft of Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's group. At the same time, he said, the USSR president has his own ideas, which will be voiced in London.

During the discussion of the present state of bilateral ties, the Japanese head of government expressed satisfaction with the contacts that have taken place in recent months. In his opinion they indicate that the recent visit by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Japan was an important milestone in the development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Answering questions from TASS' correspondent after his talk with the Japanese prime minister, Yevgeniy Primakov said that in the runup to the London conference Soviet representatives are holding a series of meetings with the participants, in order to explain the efforts being made in the USSR both in the economic sphere and in politics. Such contacts help to find the points of contact that can help in the implementation of reforms in order to make the transition to the market with support from the world's leading countries. It is quite obvious that the pace of our progress largely depends on this. "Japan," he stressed, "naturally cannot remain aloof from this process. Moreover the impression arises that Tokyo has an interest in this. In general I am satisfied with the results of the exchange of opinions."

Today, Yevgeniy Primakov had a long talk with Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Koji Watanabe, who is responsible on the Japanese side for preparations for the "G-7" meeting in London.

Comments on Japan, G-7

LD0507193891 Moscow All-Union Radio First
Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT
5 Jul 91

[Interview with USSR "special representative" Yevgeniy Primakov, by correspondent Konstantin Kupin; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] One of the topics at the coming 15-19 July meeting in London of the leaders of seven advanced capitalist countries will be the question of extending economic assistance to the Soviet Union. A prominent role in the activities of the big seven is played by Japan. Here is a report by our Tokyo correspondent, Konstantin Kupin.

[Kupin] Of late, the topic of economic assistance to the Soviet Union and predictions in respect of the coming meeting in London have been the main themes in Japan's news bulletins. There has been an active debate here about the possible options for action by the Japanese leadership on the issue of extending assistance to Soviet economic reform. It must be noted that most of the predictions and proposals are fairly cautious in their character. After all, it is no secret that despite assurances, just recently, by local high-ranking politicians Japan is still adhering to its well-known position based on the principle of not separating politics and economics.

In this situation, it would seem, an exchange of views and a clear definition of the partner's position is extremely important. Indeed, the trip to Japan by Yevgeniy Primakov, the USSR president's special representative, was devoted to this. Here is what he had to say in an interview on the results of his meetings in Tokyo.

[Primakov] Our Japanese partners attempted to ascertain details connected with our transition to the market. I spoke, too, about our understanding of how much there is a link, and it seems to me there is a great link and there is much in common in them between the government's plan, which is supported by 13 republics, and the plan of the Yavlinskiy group, which was worked out at Harvard in the United States. This issue was very pointedly raised by the Japanese. Evidently, there had been some speculation here in the press. Incidentally, however, when I asked them to cite some examples demonstrating the confrontational nature of these two plans and their incompatibility, they did not present any examples for me. This was simply because my questioners obviously were not aware of the details.

The main thing is that both these plans are directed at a transition to the market and there are varying degrees of radical measures. In this respect, one cannot say that one is more radical and the other less so. In different parts, perhaps, one may be more radical and the other less so. At any rate, the fact that I gave these clarifications to the Japanese was useful. Also, you know, representatives of the president have been in the United States and there have been meetings with European leaders. In these

circumstances, the Japanese might consider that they have been somewhat sidelined, and no one would want that. All of us are well aware what a big role Japan plays in world economics and in world politics. That really is what the purpose of my visit was.

Kim Il-Song, Gorbachev on Treaty Jubilee

*PM0507171491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Jul 91 First Edition p 1*

[Exchange of 5 July messages between M. Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and DPRK president, on 30th anniversary of USSR-DPRK friendship treaty]

[Text] [Message from Gorbachev] To the General Secretary of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee, President of the DPRK,

Comrade Kim Il-song

Please accept congratulations on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the conclusion of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and the DPRK, which accords with the vital interests of both countries and serves the cause of peace and security in the Korean Peninsula and the Asian-Pacific region.

The Soviet Union is in favor of the further development of Soviet-Korean cooperation based on the principles of complete equality and in our mutual interests.

I wish you and all the republic's working people prosperity, peace, and the peaceful reunification of Korea.

M. Gorbachev,

Moscow, Kremlin,

5 July 1991.

[Message from Kim Il-song] To the President of the USSR, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee,

Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the conclusion of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the DPRK and the USSR, I send cordial congratulations to you and the Soviet people.

The Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the two countries—Korea and the Soviet Union—was an expression of the desire of the Korean and Soviet peoples to strengthen and develop the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries which grew up in the course of the joint struggle for peace and socialism, and over the period that has elapsed it made a great contribution to

the cause of the building of socialism in the two countries and the defense of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

The significance of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between Korea and the Soviet Union will continue to be seen in the context of relations between the two countries.

May I take this opportunity to wish you and the Soviet people success in the cause of achieving stability and prosperity for the country and ensuring peace throughout the world.

Kim Il-song,

General Secretary of the WPK Central Committee, president of the DPRK.

5 July 1991

Pyongyang.

Commentary on 1961 DPRK Treaty

*SK0807065791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean
1100 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Article by Moscow Radio commentator Oleg Alekseyev from "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] First of all, I would like to point out the political significance of the USSR-DPRK treaty signed in 1961.

This document was prepared by taking into account the practical situation of the Peninsula. In other words, the fact that there were two Korean states on the Peninsula was taken into consideration. Based on this, political tasks and policies for activities were prescribed between the Soviet Union and the DPRK.

This document called for a peaceful and political solution to Korea's reunification. This is still valid today. I would like to point out a few points characteristic of this (?document).

In the course of reunifying the two Koreas, Moscow will not interfere in their domestic affairs, and it recognizes that it has no right to do so. However, Moscow is ready to help achieve this goal in many ways.

We highly appraise the 1961 treaty which contributed to consolidating friendly relations with the DPRK. Thus, this treaty is of great significance to Soviet history.

In September last year, the Soviet Union established diplomatic relations with Seoul. Since that time, Moscow attaches great importance to cooperation for mutual benefit with the ROK. However, this does not mean the abandonment of traditional friendly relations with the DPRK as Pyongyang insists from time to time. Such doubt is groundless.

Still, one of the priority tasks in Soviet foreign policy is to maintain and develop friendly relations with the

DPRK. The Soviet Union emphasizes this whenever it has exchanges with the ROK. Seoul is not opposed to such an attitude by the Soviet Union.

Although friendly relations were forged between Moscow and Pyongyang, this does not necessarily mean that the (two sides) should always reach unanimous agreement on their positions.

The time when one regards acceptance of the other's position as an obligation has passed. Differences in views may always exist. This is a rule of life. Friendly relations between nations should not necessarily reach a (supreme) point nor should they turn into relations that sever the good-neighbor relationship and cooperation.

Differences in opinions should be adjusted in such a way as to be accepted by both sides. When one evaluates the other's position, one should have patience and prudence. Proceeding precisely from this stance, the Soviet Union established relations with the DPRK.

MPR Envoy Notes 'Critical Time' in Relations

LD0707071491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1104 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 6 July (TASS)—Diplomatic correspondent Basiliy Titov: Mutual understanding and deep trust are characteristic of Soviet-Mongolian relations—they are the security for their development and the basis for overcoming current difficulties. This is what Nyamyn Mishigdorj, Mongolian People's Republic [MPR] believes. Today, he gave an interview to a TASS correspondent on the eve of Mongolia's national holiday—the 70th anniversary of the Mongolian people's revolution.

Relations between our two countries are going through a critical time, the ambassador noted. Along with all that is positive in these traditionally friendly relations, over the years, quite a few problems have also built up. In the view of the diplomat, they can be resolved with the aid of careful work on perfecting the legal basis of cooperation by means of drawing up an inventory of old treaties and agreements. He emphasized that in doing this, it is important to preserve everything that is really mutually beneficial and valuable.

Nyamyn Mishigdorj considers that more active political and economic links with the republics could be a new phase in Soviet-Mongolian cooperation. The ambassador thinks that the most promising of these are the direct links between Mongolia and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The Mongolian diplomat noted that these relations have a great future, particularly after the conclusion of the new union treaty.

Touching upon specific aspects of further cooperation of the sides in the defense sphere, the MPR ambassador noted that in the interests of guaranteeing security in Asia, cooperation in this sphere must be preserved. The Mongolian side, in the words of the ambassador, is

interested in training military specialists in the Soviet Union. Cooperation in the military-technical field is also important.

Characterizing the overall prospects for the development of relations between the countries, Nyamyn Mishigdorj emphasized that searching for new forms of effective Soviet-Mongolian links and seeing them working more actively is one of the main priorities for the government of his country. Having expressed his certainty that these tasks will be successfully resolved, the MPR ambassador emphasized in conclusion that the 70-year friendship and the close ties between the two peoples will stand firm and will not be affected by the vagaries of the moment.

'Mongolia Days' Open in Moscow

PM0507090991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Moscow Edition p 4

[Report by V. Ganshin: "Mongolia Days Have Opened"]

[Text] On the eve of the 70th anniversary of the victory of the people's revolution in Mongolia (the people of the neighboring republic celebrate this date 1 July) Mongolia Days in the Soviet Union opened in Moscow. Both the Soviet Union and the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] are living through a complex period of their histories. Economic problems and the political situation in Moscow and Ulaanbaatar are features of this summer. Cracks have also appeared in bilateral relations. Do people feel like festivals in this situation? The festival has been held nonetheless.

The days opened in the Mongolian information and cultural center in Moscow. Zh. Gurragecha [name as transliterated], chairman of the central council of the Mongolian-Soviet friendship society, and his counterpart in both public work and as a cosmonaut, V.V. Gorbatko, delivered a brief welcoming speech to those assembled. Both Zh. Gurragecha and V.V. Gorbatko spoke bitterly of how the once frank and natural relations between neighbors are now being tested for endurance. But however Soviet-Mongolian mutual relations may take shape now, the friendship which was founded 70 years ago and which has traveled a long path should not be extinguished. These are temporary complications, good prospects lie ahead for both peoples. In their work the friendship societies in our countries proceed from the premise that mutual understanding and good-neighborliness in big politics begin in a small way—with acquaintance and sympathy between individual people, families, and collectives. The Mongolia Days which have opened in our country are also designed to serve this mutual recognition.

The program of the Mongolia Days in the USSR includes performances by artistes, the holding of art exhibitions, and meetings at enterprises with representatives of the public of the capital and Novosibirsk.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Congratulates Vietnam's Do Muoi

LD0107135391 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT
1 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 1 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, has cordially congratulated Do Muoi with his election as head of the Vietnamese Communist Party.

The Soviet leader, in a message circulated here today, expressed confidence that "Historically established ties of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of Vietnam, between the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples will continue to strengthen and develop in the future."

Shenin Accepts Some 'Blame' in Vietnam Ties

PM0307160991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by correspondents M. Domogatskikh and P. Tsvetov: "Lessons To Be Learned"]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 Jun—A CPSU delegation took part in the the work of the Seventh Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Congress which ended on Thursday. M. Domogatskikh and P. Tsvetov, PRAVDA's correspondents in Hanoi, put questions to O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who headed the delegation:

[PRAVDA] Oleg Semenovich! What was your impression of the Vietnamese Communists' congress?

[Shenin] It was good. I was impressed by the fact that Vietnamese Communists did a lot of preparatory work and that its delegates had discussed the main questions a week before the official opening of the congress. The documents adopted clearly confirm that the Communist Party is true to its socialist choice.

Concern for people is clearly evident in the policy of renewal being conducted in Vietnam. The program put forward by the congress is aimed primarily at the solution of socioeconomic questions and, of course, will meet with no objections from those who think seriously about working people and the people's interests.

We got favorable impressions of the situation in the country. There are difficulties, but there are also improvements in the economic sphere, and political stability is being preserved.

The fact that the congress analyzed the path traveled so far made a good impression. It made its analysis critically but calmly and did not denigrate anyone. The senior comrades who left the Politburo moved on to prestigious posts.

We are grateful to Vietnamese Communists for their kinds words to the CPSU and the Soviet people and for the warm reception which we received. Despite the current complexities in our relations (for which the Soviet side also bears blame) there were no negative comments leveled at us during the congress. The Vietnamese comrades understand that we are going through a difficult period, and they hope that these difficulties will be overcome and that our ties will develop fruitfully.

[PRAVDA] How do you assess the state of CPSU-CPV interparty ties?

[Shenin] Our links are quite good. They exist both at the level of Soviet oblast party committees and Vietnamese provincial party committees and at the highest level, as demonstrated by M.S. Gorbachev's meetings with Nguyen Van Linh and Do Muoi in May this year.

But I think that for the present stage this is no longer adequate. We in the USSR are carrying out perestroika. Vietnam is engaged in renewal. We have things to learn from our Vietnamese friends. That makes it necessary to expand contacts. In view of the limited party budget, communists must use the full potential of visits at local level and the level of state organs and social organizations. We could derive great benefit from that. Take the sphere of party organizational work. Here the Vietnamese communists are acting more purposefully and confidently than we; they have a precise line. The party's firmness on political questions is not contrary to the development of a market economy. The CPSU must also face these problems.

[PRAVDA] What can you tell us about trade and economic relations between our two countries?

[Shenin] I feel personally what is going on in this sphere—the disruption of established ties, the nonfulfillment of accords. I cannot understand why, when implementing the transition to the market economy, we start by severing links with partners which have lasted many years. What question can there be of implementing the Vladivostok, Krasnoyarsk, and Khabarovsk initiatives if we are not greatly bothered about the development of trade and economic ties in this region and if we do not seek to use the positions we have gained. That is a problem of the region as a whole. After all, the situation in Laos and Cambodia is similar to that in Vietnam.

Who can explain why we do not obtain Vietnamese rice or footwear or other consumer goods ready for export to the USSR? Our lack of cooperativeness at state level is incomprehensible. I would like the relevant organs to work on this problem. For example, questions of transport and shipments from Vietnam to the Soviet Union require the most serious examination. I believe that

ultimately the difficulties that have emerged will be overcome by efforts by Union and republic organs. This corresponds to the vital interests of the Soviet and Vietnamese peoples.

CPSU Greets Cambodian Party Anniversary

*91P50239A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4*

[CPSU Central Committee Secretariat greetings message to the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party on the 40th anniversary of its founding; "To the Central Committee of the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party"]

[Text] On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party, we wish the Central Committee and all the members of the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party success in accomplishing the resolutions of the Second All-Cambodian Party Conference, the achievement of national reconciliation and the revival of the country in the interests of the Cambodian people, and the consolidation of peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

We are confident that the fraternal ties between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party and the friendship and cooperation of the Soviet and Cambodian peoples will strengthen and develop in the future.

Bangkok Attitude Toward Phnom Penh Analyzed

*BK0507104191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian
1100 GMT 4 Jul 91*

[Text] Before the end of this year, Thai Foreign Minister Asa Sarasin will pay an official visit to Phnom Penh. This was announced by the Thai Foreign Ministry spokesman who also said Bangkok is considering the possibility of opening its embassy in Phnom Penh. In the view of our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, this news should be best analyzed in the context of Thailand's policy toward the Indochinese countries.

A few weeks after a military coup took place in February which put the current interim cabinet in power in Bangkok, the shape of this policy started to emerge. In many respects, this policy is the continuation of the policy of the previous government, that of Chunhawan. For example, a move by the new cabinet, which drew the most attention, was the agreement with Laos on the withdrawal of troops from a sector along the Thai-Lao border. By early April, this troop pullout was actually carried out by both parties under the control of a joint military committee. Thus, a tense situation which has lasted for many years disappeared.

Our observer continues:

I would like to recall new measures taken by the new Thai leadership aimed at expanding good neighborliness

relations with Vietnam. As a result of inter-governmental talks in the summer, Thailand and Vietnam agreed to expand cooperation in various fields, including trade and economy. Hanoi considered as a goodwill gesture the order issued by Thailand's new leadership to take measures to disarm immigrants, living in Thailand, who opposed the Hanoi government.

The only point which is not clear cut in Bangkok's policy toward the Indochinese countries is the stance Thailand has adopted in relations with Phnom Penh. It ought to be said however that since June, the Thai leadership has promised to provide humanitarian aid to Cambodia and expressed its sincerity to find a political solution for this country.

At the same time, however, Bangkok has made it known to everyone that it has no intention of dealing with the Phnom Penh government. And now there is this report saying that in the future the Thai Foreign Minister will visit Phnom Penh. What is happening? What does the readiness of Bangkok, which is very clear this time, to normalize relations with Phnom Penh show?

In my view, this especially comes from the increased prestige of the Phnom Penh government and this government's role in solving the Cambodian problem. Was it not a characteristic feature that at the recent meeting in Phatthaya, Cambodian parties were able to agree among themselves that from now on Phnom Penh will be the permanent headquarters of the Cambodian Supreme National Council, which was set up in the second half of last year?

It is certain that reasons of a more general nature were involved. In the Asia-Pacific region, including Southeast Asia, the tendency to normalize international relations is growing stronger and stronger. The idea of greater cooperation for the benefit of peace is taking firmer root. In such a condition, abandoning the outdated idea of confrontation—the legacy of the cold war era—is necessary and this has to happen. This is why as part of this tendency, Bangkok's attitude toward relations with Phnom Penh is reasonable, concludes our observer Comrade Oleg Alekseyev.

Soviet, Australian Firms Sign Technical Deal

*OW0307140291 Beijing XINHUA in English
1320 GMT 3 Jul 91*

[Text] Canberra, July 3 (XINHUA)—Australia's OTC Limited, an overseas telecommunications company, has signed a ground-breaking deal to assist in the development and management of international communications in the Soviet republic of Kazakhstan.

The five-year business cooperation contract was signed this week by OTC Limited and Kaztelecom, the operating company representing the Kazakh Ministry of Communications, according to a statement by the Australian company today.

Under the new agreement, OTC International will initially install an Australian-designed digital earth station to provide international telephone and facsimile services on the Intelsat satellite network.

The agreement envisages the installation of a new digital international exchange during the next 18 months to dramatically upgrade the communications capacity of the republic.

In addition, OTC International will undertake an extensive training program within Kazakhstan to expand the pool of local telecommunications expertise and lay a solid platform for further communications development.

Situated in central Asia, Kazakhstan is among the most progressive and stable of the Soviet republics. With an area of nearly 3 million square kilometers, a large central desert, wheat and minerals production, Kazakhstan has many similarities with Australia. The republic is the main Soviet space center.

OTC's managing director Steve Burdon said today that the new agreement with Kazakhstan, which currently has access to only eight international telecommunications circuits, is an important foothold for Australia in the Soviet communications market.

The installation of OTC's earth station later this year in the Kazakh capital, Alma Ata, will immediately boost the number of circuits to almost 30 and greatly reduce any risk of congestion, Burdon said in the statement.

In 1990-91, OTC International signed business agreements worth around 350 million Australian dollars (268 million U.S. dollars) and it holds long-term contracts in countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli 'Bullheadedness' Criticized

LD0807160791 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT
8 Jul 91

[By international observer Yuriy Tyssovsky]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—As promises by U.S. officials to turn the Middle East into an oasis of peace after the Gulf war crumble, a legitimate question arises: Who is to blame for this? One way or another, the answer clearly points to Israeli authorities.

Yitzhak Shamir, the head of what everybody agrees is the most right-wing cabinet in the history of his country, acts as if the allied victory over Saddam Hussayn's armies gave him the carte blanche to pursue the most extremist Middle East policy aimed at averting the political settlement of the crisis in the region.

That U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's four Middle East tours ended in failure should be fully blamed on Tel-Aviv's bullheadedness. The Israeli leadership was uncooperative not because its position was based on

some cardinal principles the negligence of which might push the Jewish state to the brink of destruction. There is no sensible reason behind Israel's demand that the United Nations be kept out of the negotiation process or that the regional conference on the Middle East be formally opened only to direct its work into the vein of bilateral meetings between Israel and representatives of Arab countries.

Each trip by James Baker to Jerusalem was accompanied by the creation of yet another colonist settlement on occupied Arab lands, a move that cannot be interpreted otherwise than Shamir's challenge to the strategic ally.

The Israeli Government is reported to have launched a campaign to entice new settlers to occupied territories. Tel Aviv intends to pressure Washington for a guaranteed loan of 10 billion dollars and will most likely get what it wants from the compassionate U.S. Congress even despite the U.S. administration's public objections.

Anyway, Shamir is ready with threats that he would rather forfeit U.S. aid than expanded colonization of Arab lands. This approach pokes fun at the very idea of Middle East negotiations as it makes clear that Israel has no intention whatsoever to return occupied territories to their legitimate masters.

The Israeli leadership's position is also amply characterized by the latest reports from Lebanon. As is known, the disarmament has been completed of Palestinian groups around the South Lebanese city of Sidon, ruling out the possibility of their armed assault against Israel. Nevertheless, first Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi and then Defence Minister Moshe Arens announced that they have no intentions of withdrawing their stooges from the "defence security belt" in South Lebanon and transferring the region under Beirut's jurisdiction. Both mentioned the presence of Syrian troops in Lebanon and demanded their withdrawal.

However, while the Syrian contingent is a stabilizing force in the country, the pro-Israeli South Lebanese army is playing an openly destructive role, a fact deliberately "overlooked" by Israel.

Judging from its reactions, Washington is vexed by Israel's uncooperative stance but reluctant to apply pressure to bring Shamir and other to their senses. It is high time to act, because progress towards peace depends to a great degree on U.S. diplomacy's persistent efforts.

Israeli Consul on Middle East Peace

OW0807052391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Israeli defence minister, Mr. Moshe Arens, at the end of two days of the talks in Washington has spoken of improved chances for peace talks between

Israel and the Arabs. He is quoted as saying that Israel was nearer to opening talks with Palestinians than with any other side concerned. Israel's Chief Consul in the Soviet Union, Mr. Arich Levin, told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent that the defence minister's statement may have been intended to indicate an overall change for the better. For his own part, Mr. Levin did not think there was anything substantially new adding that talks as such had not yet started. In his view, neither Palestinians nor Israel's Arab neighbours, except Egypt, have defined their position, nor is there any improvement in Israeli-Syrian relations.

However, Mr. Levin said he had an impression that there were fewer obstacles on the way to a Middle East peace, and that new opportunities were now unravelling in the postwar period in the Gulf. The Arabs have at last realised, he said, that Israel does not threaten anyone, nor does it try to block Middle East peace talks. In this sense, said Mr. Levin, a more will wishing approach can be expected from the Arabs.

The Israeli diplomat also pointed to a change inside Israel itself. Where the intifahda was subsiding because the Palestinian Arabs were increasingly being aware that terrorism was no solution to their problems. Mr. Levin said the intifahda reaped its own toll of Arab lives while infighting among the Arabs had become routine. The Chief Consul also spoke of Palestians now starting to think for themselves without any suggestions from the outside, including PLO, although admitting that the problem still remained.

On Israel's attitude to a Middle East peace conference, Mr. Levin said it was unchanged. He said his country had always called for talks with Palestinians, Jordan, and other Arab countries but on a bilateral basis. If the Arabs continue to act in groups rather than singly, said Mr. Levin, they are likely to start competing against to find who performs best in the conflict with Israel, which, he said, will lead nowhere.

In conclusion, the Israeli Chief Consul in the Soviet Union, Mr. Arich Levin, said his country was ready to hold talks with all Arabs, and above all, with Palestinians. He also expressed the hope that the Middle East peace conference was just a matter of timing. The sooner, the better, he said.

Baku-Tel Aviv Air Link Agreement Signed

LD0407130191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1125 GMT 3 Jul 91

[By correspondent Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku, 3 Jul (TASS)—Vagif Sadykhlyi, director general of the "Azerbaijani airlines" ("Azala"), who returned yesterday from this near east country [as received], spoke today about the organization of charter flights between the capitals of Azerbaijan and Israel.

He reported that an agreement on the opening of this new air route was signed with "Evtr," Israel's major tourist corporation. The flights between Baku and Tel Aviv which are due to open in August, will be by native TU-154m aircraft, using Azerbaijani airline crews which work on foreign routes. Each week, on a Wednesday, they will be capable of carrying more than 300 passengers in both directions.

For the route to pay for itself, it will initially be used predominantly for the organization of individual and group tourist trips. In accordance with the agreement, airline tickets available for freely convertible hard currency will be sold in Tel Aviv by the Israeli corporation. It has been declared the general agent for "Azala" in its own country, having also received the right to sell tickets for Israeli transit passengers travelling through Baku to other towns in the Soviet Union. It is envisaged that the hard currency payments for fuel and other commercial services at Tel Aviv's Ben Gurion Airport will be met with the aid of foreign partners.

Involvement in Iraqi Nuclear Program Denied

OW0507075891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 4 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Union has nothing to do with Iraqi nuclear facilities which Baghdad has been concealing from international inspections. The only nuclear reactor built with the Soviet assistance was located to the south from Baghdad and was destroyed by Israeli fighter-bombers.

Iraq has to fulfil all the provisions of the UN Security Council resolution 687 which calls for the creation of conditions conducive to the settlement in the region. Anatoly Filev, first deputy of the Middle East and Northern Africa department chief in the Soviet foreign ministry, said today (on July 4) to DP [Diplomatic Panorama]. He expressed his regret that Baghdad has demonstrated no openness in its approach toward the inspection of its nuclear facilities, which prompted the mission of the UN Secretary General and the IAEA to draw appropriate conclusions.

The Soviet Union will not change its position with regard to the fundamentals of the Gulf settlement and will insist that Iraq fully and unconditionally abide by all decisions taken by the international community on this issue.

Egyptian Ambassador Gives Message For Gorbachev

LD0607154291 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT
6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Belonogov received today ambassador of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the USSR Ahmad

Mahiral-Sayyid. He handed a message of Egyptian President Husni Mubarak to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Ahmad Mahir also handed a message of Egyptian Foreign Minister Amr Musa to his Soviet counterpart Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

Belonogov and Ahmad Mahir discussed some aspects of the Middle East situation and the starting of a peace process, aimed at settling the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Foreign Ministry Watches Algerian Situation

OW0807050791 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Ministry officials say their ministry is watching closely the developments in Algeria. Our diplomatic correspondent was told that the ministry's guarded approach was caused by concern for a large contingent of Soviet nationals working in that country. Soviet experts work at a total of 73 places there. The Soviet officials also said that the United States and other Western countries were being led by similar considerations.

East Europe

Reaction to Situation in Yugoslavia

Gorbachev Message to Markovic

LD0707063791 Moscow TASS in English 0623 GMT
7 Jul 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Ovcharenko]

[Text] Belgrade July 7 TASS—Support for the unity and territorial integrity of Yugoslavia and the solution of all pressing internal political issues of Yugoslavia by the peoples living in it is expressed in President Mikhail Gorbachev's message to the head of the Yugoslav Federal Government Ante Markovic. The Soviet leader's position was brought to the notice of the Yugoslav leader on Saturday by the Soviet president's special envoy Yuliy Kvitsinskiy who arrived in Belgrade for the purpose.

The Soviet president favours the solution of the domestic crisis in Yugoslavia, which came to a head after Serbia and Croatia proclaimed independence at the end of last month, by democratic means which rule out the possibility of changing borders in Europe.

The Soviet Union, the message stresses, is opposed to the internationalization of the Yugoslav crisis and thinks it not expedient to convene a special session of the U.N. General Assembly devoted to recent developments in Yugoslavia.

Gorbachev Sends Telegram to Mesic

LD0507193591 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has sent a telegram of congratulations to Yugoslav Presidency President Stjepan Mesic on his election as chairman of the Presidium of the SFRY. The message says, inter alia: At this hour of trial so difficult for Yugoslavia, the USSR wishes all peoples of Yugoslavia to agree on peaceful democratic means for resolving the crisis.

Bessmertnykh Message Delivered

LD0507192691 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1817 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By correspondent Aleksandr Kondrashov]

[Text] Belgrade, 5 July (TASS)—Budimir Loncar, the SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, received Vadim Loginov, the USSR ambassador to Yugoslavia, here today.

The Soviet ambassador handed to Loncar a message from USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh that lays out the position of the Soviet Union on the involvement of international factors in connection with recent events in Yugoslavia. During the conversation, there was also discussion on the USSR's foreign policy steps in searching for ways to overcome the crisis in Yugoslavia on the basis of respect for its territorial integrity and a peaceful and democratic solution to its problems. The USSR ambassador reported that Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, special envoy of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, will arrive in the SFRY tomorrow.

Kvitsinskiy Visits Belgrade

LD0607171991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1645 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] [no dateline as received]—The Soviet Union sees Yugoslavia as a friendly state, being a component part of modern Europe, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, the USSR president's special envoy, stated after arriving in Belgrade today, during a meeting with Budimir Loncar, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs.

The Soviet diplomat expressed the USSR's willingness to provide aid to Yugoslavia to deal with its internal political problems, favoring as it does the preservation of its unity and territorial integrity. He reported that at the meeting which took place on Friday with FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev advocated overcoming the Yugoslavian crisis exclusively by peaceful, democratic means.

The head of the SFRY foreign policy department briefed his Soviet guest on the current domestic political situation in the country and its recent activity on the international arena. He highly assessed the constructive position of the Soviet Union with regard to Yugoslavia on the principles of recognition of its unity and territorial integrity.

On the same day the Soviet diplomat met with Slobodan Mikosevic, president of the Serbian Republic.

Kvitsinskiy Meets Markovic

LD0707073191 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT
7 Jul 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Ovcharenko]

[Text] Belgrade July 7 TASS—During a meeting here head of the Yugoslav Government Ante Markovic and Soviet presidential envoy Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, Markovic said that all measures taken lately by the government of his country aim to preserve the country's international legal status and ensure Yugoslavia's state borders.

Markovic noted that attempts have been made lately to exercise outside influence on developments in Yugoslavia and pointed to the inadmissibility of foreign intervention in the processes under way in his country in the name of democracy. Only Yugoslav people should be involved in the search for ways to pull the country out of the crisis, he stressed.

After the meeting with the Yugoslav premier, the Soviet president's special envoy departed to Zagreb, capital of Croatia.

Kvitsinskiy Meets Mesic, Tudjman

LD0707123391 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1144 GMT 7 Jul 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Ovcharenko]

[Text] Belgrade, 7 Jul (TASS)—Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, the special envoy of the USSR president who is in Yugoslavia, has met Stipe Mesic, chairman of the SFRY Presidium, and Franjo Tudjman, president of Croatia, in Zagreb today.

In the course of their conversation, the sides discussed the current internal political situation in Yugoslavia since the republics of Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence at the end of last month.

Today the USSR president's special envoy is to arrive in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, where he is to meet the Republic's leaders.

Markovic, Slovenia's Stanic Cited

PM0507182091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 6 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Report by IAN correspondents S. Gryzunov, A. Baturin from Ljubljana and Belgrade, incorporating brief comment by Federal Executive Council Chairman A. Markovic and interview with Stane Stanic, former Slovenian information minister, under the rubric "Situation in Yugoslavia"—date of interviews not stated: "We Cannot Survive Without Reason"]

[Text] Ljubljana, Belgrade—"We cannot survive without reason"—that is how A. Markovic, chairman of the SFRY Federal Executive Council (government), answered a question from IAN correspondents on what the country needs today.

In fact, the situation in Yugoslavia is such that many people—politicians, military men, ordinary people—are so caught up in the maelstrom of events that they have lost their heads. Emotion has prevailed over reason.

Today the conflicts in Yugoslav society—political, economic, national, social, spiritual, and religious—have reached their highest degree. A fratricidal war has begun.

On 4 July people in the SFRY traditionally remember those who gave their lives in the struggle against the fascist occupiers. This year's holiday was overshadowed by the need to count new losses. Around 40 soldiers and officers of the Yugoslav People's Army have died at the hands of their own people, both Slavs and Slovenians.

What next? In Ljubljana, capital of Slovenia, Stane Stanic, member of the Slovenian group of the international committee for verifying the fulfillment of the Helsinki decisions and the republic's former minister of information, tried to answer this question for us:

"There could be even more casualties. A peaceful solution to the conflict through mutual compromises is also possible. Only one thing is impossible—a return to the former Yugoslavia. As long ago as six months the Slovenians came out in favor of the confederation model and expressed readiness for talks. But Belgrade hoped to use military force to change the situation quickly in its own favor.

"It did not work. Moreover, why are the federal authorities presenting Slovenia with an ultimatum, while turning a blind eye to the substantial Serbian armed formations that are conducting guerrilla operations on Croatian territory?

"We no longer want Ljubljana's fate to be decided in Belgrade. We want to do it ourselves."

A justified wish, but it is being implemented at too high a cost.

A glimmer of hope has again appeared today. At last, after a lengthy break, the collective head of state—the SFRY Presidency, having assembled almost in full

(except for Slovenia's representative), adopted a decision by 1200 hours on 7 July to restore the status quo that existed on Yugoslavia's borders prior to 26 June—the day of the proclamation of Slovenia's independence; to return to their garrisons the forces of the regular army and the newly created armed formations; to cease fire; and to release prisoners, who number more than 2,000.

Will a fragile peace be restored in Slovenia? That also depends on the situation in the neighboring republic of Croatia, to where the center of tension was beginning to shift in recent days. This was because of an acute flare-up in ethnic conflict between Croatians and Serbs—the peoples forming the largest ethnic groups in the Yugoslav federation. It is their mutual relations that will determine the country's future.

Time will tell. But very little time is left. Only 90 days—that is the period of the moratorium on the implementation of the decision on the secession of Slovenia and Croatia.

Republic Presidents View Events

PM0807092391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 4

[Roundup of Views by Republic Leaders entitled "What They Think..." in a feature under the general heading "Why the Balkan Volcano Has Stirred"]

[Text]

E. Gamsakhurdia:

The bloody conflict is due mainly to the reactionary federal government's commitment to communist ideas. No conflicts, including national ones, should develop into armed clashes.

Are analogies appropriate? I think that the "Balkanization" of Georgia and clashes with Union troops are possible only in the event of a reactionary coup in the Kremlin.

V. Landsbergis:

What is happening in Yugoslavia is the rejection of the communist system and at the same time the realization of the peoples' right to self-determination.

People are trying to intimidate Europe by saying that the splitting up of European countries into small but sovereign states will lead to a revision of borders and, consequently, war. In the hope that it will agree to dictatorship in the name of peace. The problem is not one of the scale of the states which form Europe but of the principles on which the states themselves and Europe are built.

In my view there is one solution. That is the independence of Slovenia and Croatia. The subsequent process is one of the political and state self-determination of the rest of Yugoslavia. They can create confederative ties.

Furthermore, with free and democratic transformation the [remaining?] parts of Yugoslavia can think about mutually beneficial relations with neighboring countries—Slovenia and Croatia. Even if all the members of the former Yugoslav federation want to be separate states for a given time I see no danger to Europe in that.

L. Ter-Petrosyan:

A nation's right to self-determination is absolute. If the people have decided to take their future into their own hands, nothing, not even violence, can reverse those processes. As Slovenia has shown and the Soviet republics will show.

UN Association Issues Appeal

LD0607060891 Moscow TASS in English 0603 GMT
6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—"During these hours of anxiety for the fates of the peoples of Yugoslavia, for the stable development of Europe and the world community as a whole we consider it our duty to express our deep concern over the dangerous situation in that country," the Soviet U.N. Association says in its appeal addressed to people in Yugoslavia.

The document contains a call on Yugoslav brethren and sisters to use every available opportunity, including the U.N. peace-making experience, its relevant mechanisms and methods, and the nascent European process structures to prevent bloodbath and create conditions for the peaceful settlement of the political and national crisis in Yugoslavia.

Parallels Seen

PM0807081591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 1

[Igor Korolkov "Observer's Opinion": "This Could Happen to Us, Too"]

[Text] I feel as though I am watching the crash of an aircraft for which I tried to get a ticket but failed. Everything that is happening in Yugoslavia today could happen here in Russia. And in Georgia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania, and Latvia it almost has.

Communist regimes are disappearing around the world. But they do so while clinging onto the past and to other people's lives. The Belgrade center is scarcely different from the Moscow rightist center. And their reaction to the striving of their vassals to live free of Communist ideology and barrack-like communal life is identical. They have no arguments. They have nothing but tanks and Special Purpose Militia Detachments which are not being used according to their proper purpose.

The army's help did not enable them to overthrow the legitimate democratic governments of the Baltic but they did manage to preserve the CPSU's power in Azerbaijan. The price—more than 100 lives.

Our situation is very similar to Yugoslavia's. But nevertheless there is a difference between them. We have already traveled the path by which Gorbachev, who in the past gave his blessing to Communist putschists in the Baltic, became more a president than general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. And the election of the president of Russia strengthened democracy's position all the more and weakened the Communist Party. The "Nine plus One" agreement recognized the republics' right to independence. And even though these steps take us further and further from the danger point, it is too soon to talk of the complete elimination of the danger from the people of the past. Recall what our USSR Supreme Soviet is like, what the influence of the "Soyuz" group is like within it, and how aggressive many members of the CPSU Central Committee are not to mention the Russian Communist Party and the top military functionaries. They would have sent in the bombers, they would not have balked at using tank columns 30 km long. There have already been attempts. They aren't trying any more. That means something is holding them back.

I would have given a lot to be able to hear how the supporters of the "iron fist" assess the Yugoslav tragedy when they are speaking off the record and among friends. Do they argue with cold professionalism how a military operation should have been carried out? Do they criticize the indecision of the command, which perhaps learned from us? Or do they all the same see the foolhardiness of their colleagues albeit in someone else's example? Do they understand the senselessness of the human casualties already caused? For the sake of what? For what aims? Is it really in the name of Yugoslav socialism's gains?

And what do the USSR president, the country's people's deputies, and the members of the government think about all this? Does the example of the uncontrolledness of the Yugoslav People's Army give them anxious thoughts? Is their own under control? Is the safety catch on this mighty weapon securely fastened? After all, this has happened, too—neither the country's defense minister nor the minister of internal affairs gave the order to burn down the Lithuanian customs posts but they burned nonetheless. Are they drawing conclusions—that is what is worrying.

Few people know—they do not like to talk about it in our country—that in Chile communists have launched vigorous terrorist activity. They are assassinating politicians and planting bombs. That is how they struggle for the ideals on which the CPSU has raised extremists in all continents. As is well known, the government in Chile is democratic now and people's lives there are not bad. In any event, better than they were 20 years ago.

I am saying this to remind people yet again what we are proceeding from and what we want to tear ourselves away from. Terrorism was the state policy of the country in which we were born. So, whether on all fours or

crawling on our bellies, dodging and weaving or stumbling, let us move any way we can from the quagmire that has almost swallowed us. The road may be longer and more tortuous but it does not matter so long as there are no funeral orations along the way.

Let us bow our heads before the Yugoslav tragedy and think. Think hard about our own destiny.

Causes Analyzed

PM0807084591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 6 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Historical Sciences V. Romanov article under the rubric "Situation in Yugoslavia": "The Causes of the Crisis: How the Proclamation of Independence Is Becoming the Detonator of Tragic Events"]

[Text] What began in Yugoslavia on 25 June and is going on now has its own history and causes, of course.

As is well known, the immediate reason for the conflict which erupted was the declaration on 25 June of independence by two Yugoslav republics—Slovenia and Croatia. The very act of proclaiming independence by Slovenia and Croatia was not a surprise. The date was announced well in advance. They prepared for it thoroughly and proceeded gradually but consistently—through unilateral amendments to the republics' constitutions which considerably restricted the central organs' powers, declarations of full republican sovereignty, and referendums where citizens were asked to say whether they wanted to live in an independent and sovereign republic. Admittedly, the question of leaving the SFRY was generally speaking not phrased in clear or categorical terms, at least in the leadership's statements. They spoke more of the need to transform Yugoslavia into a confederation, a union of sovereign states. Recently, however, the phrasing of the question clearly began to resemble an ultimatum: either a confederation or else secession from the SFRY.

The arguments used in favor of a confederation were approximately as follows. Life itself has raised the question of the autonomy of the republics of the SFRY. The concept of federalism created by J. Broz Tito is worn out. None of the republics can satisfy its requirements or feel comfortable within the framework of a Federal Yugoslavia. The majority of the indigenous population of the republics support the idea of autonomy.

The supporters of a different viewpoint, primarily Serbia and Montenegro, set out their positions no less forcefully: The renewed Yugoslavia absolutely must be preserved as a federal state.

Here the arguments that were presented sounded very weighty. It was stressed, in particular, that the Yugoslav peoples are united by a dense and firm network of economic, political, cultural, and historical ties. Their disruption can only cause harm. No Yugoslav republic on its own can survive economically in the European

market. The disintegration of Yugoslavia is a suicidal act and is particularly senseless against the background of the tumultuous processes of integration and unification taking place in Europe.

It has not proved possible to reconcile these two polar positions. Although it seemed a number of times that the possibility of finding mutually acceptable solutions to the question of the future organization of Yugoslavia was close, the fragile compromise achieved was again wrecked by the latest increase in friction between the republics. Furthermore, the tension in relations between the republics and the level of confrontation between them and the center have continued to grow despite talks. When the Slovene and Croatian declarations of state independence were adopted, the federal authorities seemed to think that this was the last chance to thwart the processes of disintegration and preserve a united Yugoslavia, even if it was necessary to resort to force to do so.

Now, when the political and constitutional crisis in Yugoslavia has reached its peak, one can often hear the view that its main sources and the main "root of the evil" lie in the very construction of the Yugoslav federation. It is claimed in particular that the idea of uniting in a federation peoples who have not reached the "logical end" of the path of acquiring and building their national statehood and who thus are still drawn toward it is from the outset untenable and futile.

I think that there is an element of truth in this thesis. However, for the sake of objectivity and historical justice when evaluating the theory and practice of Yugoslav federalism, one should also make the following point. This form of state organization was not an historical coincidence for Yugoslavia but reflected the ancient striving of the South Slav peoples for unification. (The idea of the unity of the South Slavs has its roots in the 19th century and was, incidentally, very widespread among Croats and Slovenes.) And in the second place, it was the federation which ensured a highly balanced coordination of interests of the peoples and ethnic groups of Yugoslavia throughout the postwar period. In prewar Yugoslavia, interethnic problems were one of the main sources of the most acute conflicts which shook the whole social edifice to its foundations. Today, in conditions of the destruction of the old forms of pan-Yugoslav statehood these problems have resurfaced and are once more causing grotesque social explosions.

In the seventies the aggravation of socioeconomic problems in Yugoslavia led to an increase in interethnic friction. In these conditions the federation underwent reform. In essence it amounted to a transfer to the republics of full responsibility for their own economic, social, and cultural development. This undoubtedly had positive results: It made it possible to find for quite a long time a mutually acceptable balance of the republics' interests, to achieve thoroughly well-considered and comprehensive solutions, and to suppress manifestations of interrepublic rivalry.

However, only one of the two planned areas of the reform was implemented—the destruction of the federal bureaucratic structure, which acted as a brake on economic and social development. But the creation of a firm unifying mechanism working effectively "from below" through social self-management and giving constant impetus to the processes of integration was not achieved. Consequently, instead of statehood at federal level or etatism, as they say in Yugoslavia, what emerged was a system of power of republican and provincial state bureaucratic structures which were even more belligerent and overblown. They completely crushed the production collectives even in conditions of independence from the center and with the lack of real control "from below" they began to actively generate localistic feelings and tendencies. The disintegration processes which appeared in the economic sphere spread to the sphere of culture and then to politics and aided the rapid growth of nationalism. Furthermore, the ideas of "national romanticism" were rapidly replaced by large-scale nationalist programs with which new political parties came into being (and in a number of republics won elections). The growth of nationalism in Yugoslavia assumed the form of a "chain reaction" that was difficult to control and in which the escalation of nationalist actions in one region caused a reaction in response in other parts of the country.

The Yugoslav leadership tried to implement a course which would cure Yugoslav society of the virus of nationalism that was afflicting it by means of an "injection of market forces." The plan was that market relations would "break down" national republic barriers and become a truly unifying and integrating factor on a nationwide scale. However, it has still not proved possible to implement that scheme, either, unfortunately. The economic reform in the SFRY, which began so successfully and which surely had the best chance of success of all the East European countries, is being destroyed by those selfsame political and interethnic contradictions.

The causes of the present crisis in the SFRY are not simple, of course, and cannot be reduced to a single factor. However, the fact that one of the causes was the absence of reliable integration mechanisms capable of "balancing" the emphasis on republican autonomy in the federation is virtually in no doubt. And it is no coincidence that the particularly tumultuous growth of separatist tendencies began after the disintegration of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY]. Whatever one may think of the LCY and its activity, it must be acknowledged that it played a most important unifying role across the whole of Yugoslavia and with its disappearance one of the last barriers to centrifugal processes was removed.

Resolution on Situation at CSCE

OW0807062091 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 5 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At an emergency meeting of the CSCE senior committee in Prague, called to discuss the crisis in Yugoslavia, the Soviet delegation called on the European community to issue a statement recognising Yugoslavia's territorial integrity, urging for an end to the armed conflict and the start of a peaceful dialogue between the centre and the breakaway republics of Slovenia and Croatia. The Soviet resolution received the backing of the majority of the other delegations and on consensus a declaration calling for an end to the fighting was adopted.

It was also agreed that a CSCE good will mission should be sent to Yugoslavia. The task of the delegation, which will act under the supervision of the Yugoslavian government, will be to keep the CSCE's senior committee up-to-date with developments in the country. The official Soviet position is that there must be no actual interference in Yugoslavia's internal affairs and no outside attempt to direct policy.

Gorbachev, Others Receive Albania's Islami

AU0707182191 Tirana ATA in English
0956 GMT 7 Jul 91

[Text] Tirana, July 7 (ATA)— On July 6, 1991, the President of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev received in separate meeting the chairman of the presidency of the People's Assembly of the Republic of Albania, Dr. Kastriot Islami.

During the meeting, opinions were exchanged on the development of relations between the two countries in fields of mutual interest. Dr. Kastriot Islami gave a report on the democratic processes in our country, on the activity of the pluralistic Albanian People's Assembly and of the government of national stability, on the efforts to overcome the economic difficulties in the country. He spoke also of the foreign policy of our country for peace and friendship concentrating, in particular, on the policy of good neighbourliness.

Dr. Kastriot Islami thanked the Soviet government for its support regarding Albania's full membership in the CSCE. He handed over to Soviet President Gorbachev a message from the president of the Republic of Albania, Ramiz Alia.

After expressing thanks to Islami, Mikhail Gorbachev voiced his satisfaction that relations between Albania and the Soviet Union are entering a new stage of development and voiced the readiness of the Soviet side to carry them forward. During the meeting, they also spoke about the current situation in the Balkans.

The meeting passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

The delegation of the People's Assembly, led by Dr. Kastriot Islami, was received on July 6 by the Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev. After expressing satisfaction for this meeting with the Albanian delegation,

Yanayev said that the Soviet side devotes major importance to the promotion of bilateral relations and said that they have good prospects. It is high time, he said, to exchange delegations at a higher level or other parliamentary delegations, visits of foreign ministers, to make [words indistinct] on the promotion of economic, trade relations, etc. On his part, Dr. Kastriot Islami pointed out, among other things, that a new page was opened in the relations between our two countries, which will surely be followed by their allround promotion in mutually beneficial domains. Attending this meeting was also the charge d'affaires A.I.[ad interim] of the Embassy of the Republic of Albania in the Soviet Union, Pertef Hasanmataj. On July 6, the Albanian parliamentary delegation paid a visit to the suburbs of Moscow city where it was received by the chairman of the [word indistinct] committee of Moscow okrug, Anatoli Stepanovic, as well as by other functionaries of the okrug. In this visit, the delegation was accompanied by Vazirov Halil Oglri [as received], member of the Supreme Soviet, as well as by other deputies. In honour of the delegation, an official dinner was given. It took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

West Europe

Kohl Arrives for Talks With Gorbachev

Preview of Talks

LD0507153891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] You know already, comrades, that a one-day working meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl is taking place today in Mezhhigorye, near Kiev. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl are expected to examine, among other things, problems related to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from FRG territory. Until now Germany has tried to reduce, practically to zero, its payments for the transfer of more than 21,000 buildings and structures constructed by the Soviet side on the territory of the former GDR. Moscow has suggested that Germany should pay several billion marks for that. The NOVOSTI agency report notes this detail.

Earlier, the agency's correspondents reported on the property dispute concerning the CEMA [Council for Mutual Economic Assistance] legacy. Now the positions of the sides have been formulated in a clear-cut way. The Soviet Union has stated its intention to buy out what earlier belonged to the international organization. The five European former CEMA sates—Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia—state their wish to use buildings and structures jointly in the interests of future cooperation. Observers note that the Soviet stand is based on solid legal foundations: the agreement of 7 December 1961 and later acts. It is registered there that the CEMA can hand over its buildings upon the Soviet government's consent. If there is no such consent, these buildings and structures will be bought by the Soviet

government. The position of the five, NOVOSTI stresses, is based on wishes and fairly nebulous appeals citing the interests of future cooperation.

Gorbachev Arrives, Agenda for Talks

LD0507110691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president, arrived in Kiev today to meet Helmut Kohl, FRG chancellor. Viktor Levin and Vadim Sokolov, our special correspondents, are on the line.

[Levin] Exactly 30 minutes ago, a Soviet airliner landed at the Borispol. Mikhail Sergeyevich was welcomed by Ukrainian leaders—Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet; Fokin, chairman of the Council of Ministers; and Girenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Now they have retreated for a conversation.

I would like to tell you briefly what will be discussed at the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl, FRG chancellor. The main themes are the following: the forthcoming G-7 conference in London and the progress of reforms in the Soviet Union—topics which are inseparably linked together. The second problem is economic relations between the USSR and the FRG, especially those bearing upon trade and economic links between the former GDR territory—the so-called eastern German areas now—and the Soviet Union. After all, the GDR was our major trade partner but now, frankly speaking, through joint efforts and precipitous actions, we have brought this trade to a very low level, and this is detrimental to both sides.

No doubt the property issues ensuing from the withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory will be a subject of discussion. In addition, the all-European process will be raised, and here, certainly, the problem of Yugoslavia—the acute conflict that is flaring up and, unfortunately, I think, continues to flare up in that country—will be discussed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl. They will also touch upon the Middle East, as this problem is in the center of attention, too. Discussion of other international problems is not excluded.

A lot of time has been allocated for the talks, but it is difficult to assess whether or not the leaders of the two states will manage within the time limit at their disposal. The ceremonial part, so to speak, is reduced to a minimum, but it could be very packed. The exchange of ratification documents for the big treaty, as it is called in our country and in Germany, is expected. This is the treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation signed on 9 November 1990. And right now, Mikhail Sergeyevich is having a conversation with Ukrainian leaders.

[Sokolov] Well, one should assume that the Union treaty and the impending signing of it by the Ukraine will

necessarily be at the forefront of this conversation. After all, while the republics have one after another been approving the draft and showing a readiness to sign it, the Ukraine has been a long time in replying. The thing is that in the opposition at the republican Supreme Soviet there are forces coming out against the Union treaty and its signing under any pretext, rejecting even the clearly expressed will of the Ukrainian people. Now, after the stormy debates in the republican parliament, which the entire Ukraine has been following, a decision has been adopted to submit the draft Union treaty to a legal and economic examination for its compliance with provisions of the declaration of the Ukraine's state sovereignty, and for the economic consequences of its joining the Union under the new principles. That is why the Republican Supreme Soviet will return to the issue of the Union treaty only in mid-September.

Evidently they will speak about the government program of extraordinary measures for stabilizing the economy and solving the crisis situation, which was approved by the republican Supreme Soviet, coming into effect in the Ukraine. This program does not agree in every detail with a similar anti-crisis program of the Union Cabinet of Ministers, and even stipulates the suspension of certain Union laws in the Ukraine. Quite efficient economic and administrative measures, aimed at increasing the production of foodstuffs and industrial goods, have already been brought into effect as a primary basis for the transition to the market. I can add that according to this program, beginning this month, a system of coupons has been abolished which—one must say—has helped to stabilize the market somewhat, and mainly has saved Ukrainians from the tougher system of ration cards. However, in order to protect the internal market in the republic, the government program envisages putting a special mark on the usual banknotes, and they will be accepted in the Ukraine only with this mark. This move has provoked very lively discussions among the population.

Gorbachev Welcomes Kohl to Kiev

LD0507124791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] Kiev, 5 Jul (UKRINFORM-TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Kiev at midday today. An hour and a half later, the aircraft carrying FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl landed here.

The USSR president warmly welcomed the guest at Borispol Airport. From there, the Soviet and German leaders set off for Mezhygoryev, an ancient, picturesque place near Kiev, located upstream on the Dnepr. They will have a one-day working meeting there.

Ukrainians Heckle Gorbachev

LD0507201291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] The beginning of the Gorbachev-Kohl meeting was clouded by a report from the Russian Information

Agency. For instance, a group of representatives of the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly met the Soviet leader at the airport with shouts of "For shame!", "Gorbachev out of the Ukraine!", "Ukraine without Moscow!", "No to the Union treaty".

In the center of Kiev, in Independence Square, where the motorcade of the Soviet and German leaders stopped on its way from Boissol, the crowd met the USSR president with the same slogans. Several volumes of works by Vladimir Lenin were thrown under the wheels of the cars.

In the evening, two meetings against the signing of the Union treaty were held in Kiev, organized by the Ukrainian Interparty Assembly, the Rukh movement, and the Ukrainian Republican Party.

Talks Begin

OW0807091291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1600 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Talks have begun today, Friday, between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Federal Germany's Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the Ukrainian government residence in Mezghorie, near Kiev.

No details have transpired so far, a press-conference is expected at 19:00 on the results of the talks.

The IF [interfax] correspondent reports that in the morning today, July 5, activists of the Ukrainian Independent Students' Union began picketing the German consulate office. They carried posters "The Ukraine and Germany are sovereign state. What has Gorbachev to do here?" The demonstrators' demands were handed over to spokesmen of the consulate office.

Some other opposition organisations are going to hold rallies in Kiev later today in protest against "violating the Ukraine's sovereignty".

Talks Continue

LD0507154291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] The working meeting between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, continues in Mezghorye near Kiev. Having had a two hour businesslike conversation, both leaders took a short break to walk around the park. Here they were approached by journalists awaiting a news conference which is planned for tonight. The USSR president noted, without going into more details, that he is happy with the cause of the meeting. Kohl and I know each other well and we understand each other very quickly. That is why things are going well, he said. The federal chancellor, for his part, said that he supports perestroika in the USSR and will carry on doing so.

Kohl Interviewed

LD0507151791 Hamburg DPA in German
1406 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Excerpts] Kiev (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev discussed the USSR's plans for reforms, which are a Western precondition for further specific aid to Moscow, at a country residence near Kiev today. Demonstrations for sovereignty for the Ukraine and against Gorbachev took place on the sidelines of the meeting in various places in Kiev.

Kohl hopes to encourage Gorbachev to submit a plan for state reform in the USSR at the mid-July summit in London, with specific details about the stages of its implementation. [passage omitted]

Several hundred people demonstrated for their republic's independence in front of the airport building (when Kohl arrived). They waved blue and yellow Ukrainian flags. One placard said in German: "Freedom for the Ukraine, Herr Gorbachev." Another banner, in English, opposed the "violation of Sovereignty" in the Ukraine because Gorbachev had invited Kohl to Kiev without consulting the republic's parliament. About 200 people also demonstrated for Ukrainian independence and against Gorbachev in Kiev's inner city. "Gorbachev go home," was on one of the banners. The RUCH independence movement had called for the demonstration. [passage omitted]

Kohl, on the flight to the USSR, said that he did not want to discuss new financial support from Bonn with Gorbachev. Rather, he wanted to persuade Gorbachev to submit acceptable and convincing concepts for reform to the heads of the seven major industrialized nations in London. In Kohl's view, Gorbachev should work together with his opponent, President of the Russian Republic Boris Yeltsin, on state reform of the USSR.

It was also reported by German delegation circles that a recommendation could be made in London that the Soviet Union be accepted as an associate member of the IMF in order to open the way for loans from the World Bank. Future aid for the Soviet Union could then be coordinated internationally through the IMF, the countries of the EC, and the OECD. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev, Kohl Hold News Conference

LD0507224991 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1930 GMT 5 Jul 91

[News conference addressed by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Mezghorye, near Kiev, on 5 July—recorded]

[Text] [Gorbachev] I take the opportunity of this news conference to welcome the chancellor to the Soviet Union and to this place, near Kiev, the capital of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. The chancellor and I have already met and exchanged letters and telephone calls

many times. I can say without exaggeration that every meeting, whether it lasted several days or just a short time, amounted to—or constituted, to be more exact—yet another new step toward rapprochement, cooperation, and the intensification of the political dialogue and cooperation. We are meeting Mr Kohl a short while after the 50th anniversary of the end [corrects himself] the beginning of the war, which was marked by the entire world community and our own countries. During these days we, the governments of both states and the public in our countries, have acknowledged the immense path which we have traversed in moving toward each other, toward not only reconciliation but also cooperation, culminating in the conclusion of major agreements between each other, agreements which, by their very nature, by their thrust and scale, are historic.

My conversation with the chancellor today began with this and then we spent five hours intensively discussing problems which also involved our bilateral relations. I should say that we have tried very hard not to miss a single main issue. Although there is such a volume of cooperation between us that this is more and more difficult to do. Therefore the chancellor and I asked our officials to hold a dialogue in parallel.

And so we had 10 hours of fruitful and intensive talks. Well, for me this is a usual time and pace for perestroika. But the chancellor now has his own perestroika. He calls it by a different name but it is very similar. And for this reason I have found in him a partner who has actively supported such a pace for conversations. We reported, I did this especially—at the chancellor's request—on the processes which are occurring in the country today, in our country. The chancellor was particularly interested in how the process of increasing, strengthening accord, public accord in the country is going and in the progress of work at the final stage on the Union treaty.

My work ends with this news conference but the chancellor must still hold talks with the leadership of the Ukraine, he will hold talks with the leadership of the Ukraine. We must show that we can also exploit others' labor, not just someone else [as heard]. I spoke with the chancellor for a very long time and in a very detailed manner, at first one-to-one and then with the participation of our aides about the forthcoming meeting with the G-7.

This subject took a lot of our time. We believe that it deserves it. For what is involved here is not just a symbolic but a very significant event which in itself shows that positive changes are taking place in the world. We are the ones who have been effecting them. We compared our approaches, assessments, and asked each other complex questions. But I saw the German chancellor showing great interest and solidarity for what we are trying to do in the USSR. We did not try to circumvent questions of European development. Anyway, perhaps I should not attempt to take stock of everything we talked about—I must leave something to Mr Kohl. I just wish to say that this meeting advanced

our cooperation very substantially, I think. And it was held in an atmosphere of partnership, cooperation, and mutual understanding, which has now become traditional for our meetings. Over to you.

[Kohl, in German interspersed with Russian translation] Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to give my sincere thanks to you, Mr. President, for the hospitality you have shown to us today. That is, your own hospitality and that of your colleagues, whose hospitality we have enjoyed here in the Ukraine.

It is a significant circumstance that, a few days after the 50th anniversary of the Nazi Germany attack on the Soviet Union, we are meeting here. And during our intensive, prolonged, and good conversations today, I repeatedly recalled the fact that our time is now, after all, moving, at last, in a better direction. When we spoke briefly during our drive back here from Borispol, and stopped for a few minutes in one of the main streets of Kiev, and talked to the passers-by there, one Kiev resident said: What we want is a good common future. And I can only say: that is true. And it is this common philosophy which formed the basis of the conclusion of the German-Soviet treaty: not to forget about the past but to go together to a common future and actively build it together. And this fully corresponds with the level of relations between our two countries, and first of all, the level of personal relationship between President Gorbachev and me.

From our very prolonged conversations today, I would like to single out only one subject. In several days, we will meet again at the London summit of the Group of Seven, and there President Gorbachev will also speak about the progress of the reforms which are taking place here in the Soviet Union. About a very significant reform at the level of the Union and the republics: the Union treaty, and about the progress of the economic reform. The two are inseparably interconnected. And here I would like, very definitely and clearly, to address all the women and men who are citizens of the Soviet Union—without interfering in your country's internal affairs—it is not only in the interests of the population of the Soviet Union, but actually in the interests of all the Europeans, and especially, my German fellow-countrymen, that the reforms which are under way in the Soviet Union are crowned with success.

The success of perestroika, the success of turning the country's face toward the rest of the world, is always also success for the cause of peace. And, thus, over only a few years, enormous changes have already taken place. Talks such as today's would have been inconceivable just five years ago. And therefore I am inclined to be optimistic. And, jointly with my colleagues, in London I will advocate that to the extent of our capabilities and strength we give joint support to the process of reforms and the process of openness. And even before the meeting in London I will telephone some of my colleagues to play my part so that by joint efforts we will be able to

facilitate the successful progress of the reform process in this country. Once more, thank you very much for your hospitality.

[Journalist Dolganov] Mikhail Sergeyevich, Vadim Dolganov from the Ukrainian newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA ZNAMYA. Tell us please, will today's accords facilitate more active involvement by the republics in international cooperation. And further, did Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk take part in the talks? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk and other leaders... [interrupted by German translator asking for time to translate the question]...a meeting is taking place between the president of the Soviet Union and the German chancellor. I have already said that after the news conference a meeting will take place between the chancellor and the leadership of the Ukraine. Yes, when we speak about the development of economic and other and political links between the Soviet Union and other countries, then we already have in mind the new condition and quality which distinguishes our current union state. And this new quality is connected with the fact that in all spheres, not only in domestic policy, but also in foreign policy, the initiatives and contributions of all republics will be different, more significant, and this will correspond to the real sovereignty which exists today already and which will be consolidated. I hope in the near future, in a new treaty, a Union treaty.

[Unidentified journalist in German, followed by Russian translation] President Gorbachev, have you promised Federal Chancellor Kohl that, according to the schedule, the Soviet forces which are temporarily on the territory of Germany will be withdrawn as before and that no additional demands will be put forward by the Soviet side?

[Gorbachev] I understand your leading question. Well, I think that these allusions are proceeding from both sides, but I do not think that this makes up the essence of the process. We, both sides, remain devoted to this treaty, this very important treaty. This is not a simple problem, and not just an economic, but primarily a human one. We also have understanding on this account and, taking this opportunity, I want to say that we highly value the fact that at this specific moment, some kind of interim point, respect is being shown on the part of the government of the unified Germany and on the part of political and public circles, simply of Germans, people. And, I must say, something more even than respect—a friendly disposition. I consider that this is very important, and by the same token with regard to the soldiers the German people is demonstrating its principled position with regard to the Soviet Union. We welcome this and highly value it. We have an understanding and agreement that we must resolve this task with joint efforts within the framework of the accord.

[Unidentified journalist] [Name indistinct], of the All-Union Television and Radio Company. A question to USSR President Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor

Helmut Kohl: Today you mentioned the fact that in the course of the talks, you became convinced of and found solidarity in the positions of your partner. Could you shed some light on the specific areas where this solidarity lies, and in this connection must there follow talk of London?

[Gorbachev] Allow me to restrict myself to the following words. First and foremost, in the name of our people, I must highly evaluate the solidarity of the FRG Government, and, in my view, of the people of Germany, in understanding the importance and significance of our perestroika and our reforms, and in the desire to actively participate in these processes of perestroika as far as this is possible. We also value highly what the chancellor has said today, that the German Government and Mr. Kohl himself are making known to us their point of view which contains a reference to the meaning of our perestroika for the world in a constant, competent and well-argued way. And I think that that is the most important thing that I had to say, emphasizing the solidarity of positions on the part of the FRG Government, and Mr. Kohl himself.

I am not speaking now of credits, the exchange of goods, economic links or the implementation of plans. All that exists. All this stems from that approach.

[Kohl in German, interspersed with Russian translation] I think that the president has said everything. Moreover, I can once again emphasize my fundamental and my personal position. In history a very long common path lies behind the Russians and the Germans. There were good stages and terrible ones. And now we are approaching the end of a century. A mere 10 years remain. Let us now write together a fine new chapter. And to all intents and purposes, we started upon this new path with the conclusion of our grand treaty after last year's meeting in the Caucasus by means of which, we once more obtained both the unity of Germany, and the unity of Europe, overcoming their division. This was important for us Germans, and for me personally as well. I simply have no intention of ever forgetting this. It is good both for one's personal life, and also for the joint coexistence of states not to forget something of this nature.

[Unidentified journalist, in German, followed by Russian translation] Federal chancellor: on a more concrete level, what do you expect to be the outcome of London? Do you expect some kind of statement of joint sympathy and understanding for Soviet steps to reform the state and the economy to be made there in a more general form, or can one expect some more concrete decisions, that some kind of support for this will be effected?

[Gorbachev] Good question.

[Kohl, in German interspersed with Russian translation] Mr. Murman, I could answer this question completely accurately only in the evening after the London meeting. Today I can just speak about my personal expectations

and my own hopes from that meeting. The first important event is the very fact that Mikhail Gorbachev will be present at the London meeting. And it is in our times that I am saying this, when everything is consumed [as heard] and then immediately forgotten. Even during our last year's meeting in the Caucasus we could not have foreseen anything of the kind. Second, I will be speaking—and so will be my other colleagues—in favor of ... to make everyone remember that the success of the policy of reform in the USSR will be of importance not only for the USSR but also for all of us in Europe, since this success will serve the cause of peace.

President Gorbachev will map out his concept there. We will talk to him about this. But what specific conclusions will be made ... for example, there is the possibility for the USSR to cooperate within the framework of the International Monetary Fund, as an associate member. This cooperation will lead to quite specific consequences, such as for example, the earmarking of capital for Western countries to invest in the USSR and many other things.

And I hope that I will then be able to give more exhaustive recommendations in the evening right after the London meeting. Today I have to confine myself to forecasts.

[Unidentified journalist] I'm from Japanese television—[Name indistinct] Tanaka. We are told that the Soviet-U.S. summit will be held in Moscow on 27 July. My first question is about that. And my second question: do you intend to go over to the movement which is advocating the unification of democratic forces and to leave the post of general secretary?

[Gorbachev, to Kohl] Do you want to answer that question? [laughter]

[Kohl, in German with Russian translation] No, no. I already am a party chairman. I have been for 18 years. [laughter] Misha Gorbachev is a younger chairman than I am.

[Gorbachev] I would like to answer the first question. A date for a meeting of the president of the USSR and the President of the United States, has not been fixed. Maybe you have gotten confused with 25 July, when a plenum of the party Central Committee opens to discuss the CPSU program. But you have probably paid attention, and therefore put the question, that both the president of the Soviet Union, and of the United States have expressed their desire to give an appropriate indication and impetus to those preparing the treaty on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons for signing. We have raised the level of the negotiators in Geneva. The President and I have exchanged letters with specific proposals on these issues. There is progress. I do not rule out that a meeting will perhaps still be held in July.

As for my position regarding the democratic movement—I was going to say "which has been set up" but it has not been set up yet—the democratic movement

which it is intended to organize in the country, my position comes down to the following. I welcome any democratic movements within the framework of perestroika such as are arising, it has to be said, practically not even every month but every week. You know, when I was setting out our approach to Mr. Chancellor today, I repeated something I had already said once before: we need accord in society; we need radicalization of reforms; and we have to move to a new kind of cooperation with Western countries. So, where the first point—accord—is concerned, the Nine plus One works toward that accord, and the conclusion of work on the treaty works to the benefit of such accord. And the setting-up among deputies of a very broad group for constructive accord also works to the benefit of such accord. And this movement which invites all progressive democratic forces to cooperate in the interests of ensuring success for the line of perestroika, if it retains that nature and that orientation then for my part there will be only a positive attitude.

[Unidentified journalist in German, followed by Russian translation] On our side this is the last question. A question for Mr. Gorbachev: what impact do the latest events in Yugoslavia have for the situation in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] They again remind all of us of how interdependent we are, of how we must all be considerate toward each other, and of how important it is to observe the Helsinki process and the principles of the Paris Charter. If this situation is having such acute consequences for Yugoslavia, for Europe and for all of us, it is a lesson for all the peoples of the Soviet Union, and also a warning.

On a previous occasion I told you that this country, this commonwealth of peoples, this community of peoples has been molded over 1,000 years, that it is basically a fusion resulting from 1,000 years of development, in which human destinies, the destinies of peoples and cultures are inseparably interwoven, in which the economy has developed on the basis of a profound division of labor and cooperative ties, where people did not even give a thought to borders, where only 30 percent of the borders have been recognized by state enactments. I told you that, in observing our perestroika, in particular the sphere of interethnic relations, I came to the conclusion that it is impossible for this country, for us to separate from each other. This is fraught with huge risk and unpredictable and grave consequences. Since then I have become the most convinced and ardent champion of deep reform in the Soviet Union, of implementing in practice the formula that the new, renewed Union federation must be a union of sovereign states.

And this must be accompanied by a redistribution of powers and the creation of an atmosphere in which each people will feel secure. That is why I think that the events which are taking place and the events which we are all living through—and the chancellor and I spoke about Yugoslavia—must yet again oblige everybody to ponder

the situation and understand that we are on the right path. We must follow the road of renewal and not disintegration. I shall not deviate from this road or this position—no matter what the pressure.

When we passed along the kreshchatik, some people—a group of Rukhovites probably—tried to shout things about this subject. No doubt there are still some people who have not yet shouted to their heart's content. They need the opportunity to get things off their chest. But let's not forget—and the correspondent from the Ukraine can give us the precise figure—that 74 or 75 percent called for the preservation of the union, at the referendum—74 percent wasn't it? Nobody has the right to misrepresent the wishes of the people.

That's all I have to say about Yugoslavia.

Gorbachev Departs

LD0507202191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1959 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By TASS-UKRINFORM correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev, 5 JUL—Mikhail Gorbachev left the capital of the Ukraine late this evening, after a one-day working meeting with FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, which took place in Mezhygorye near Kiev.

Kohl Departs

LD0507202591 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT
5 Jul 91

[By TASS-UKRINFORM correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev July —German Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl left the Ukrainian capital late at night today after holding a one-day working meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The meeting took place in Mezhygorye, near Kiev.

Kohl Post-Meeting Comments

LD0607125291 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT
6 Jul 91

[By correspondent Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Bonn July 6 TASS—Chancellor Kohl intends to support the Soviet Union's position at the forthcoming summit meeting in London of the leaders of the world's seven leading industrialized countries.

According to ARD television news, the chancellor said this upon his return from Kiev where he had talks with the Soviet leader.

Kohl said he had assured President Mikhail Gorbachev that Germany was interested in the success of Soviet reforms. The process of transformations in the Soviet Union, the chancellor stressed, is exercising a favourable

influence on reforms in East European countries and strengthening peace and security the world over.

Latin America & Caribbean

Mexican President Previews Visit

LD0507074291 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT
5 Jul 91

[By correspondent Sergey Gorbunov]

[Text] Mexico City July 5 TASS—President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico has said that the purpose of his visit to the Soviet Union is to strengthen cordial and respectful relations between the two countries.

In an interview published in the latest issue of SIEMPRE magazine, he said that the visit was also prompted by his desire to get an insight into changes taking place in the Soviet Union.

President Gorbachev displayed great boldness and vision by launching the process of in-depth transformations that have had a strong impact on the situation both in the Soviet Union and throughout the world, Salinas de Gortari said.

The Mexican president emphasised that the key line of his government's international strategy is to diversify foreign policy contacts despite its interest in the conclusion of a tri-partite free trade treaty with the United States and Canada.

He said the Mexican authorities view the above-mentioned treaty as a means to accelerate the economic development of the republic which has made great strides in this respect independently too.

At the same time Mexico seeks to give greater scope to relations with European countries, Japan, and Pacific rim states and strengthen political, historical and cultural ties with Latin America, the Mexican head of state said.

The president's opinion is that isolation would greatly weaken Mexico's ability to compete on external markets and, vice versa, involvement in regional integration would substantially broaden its opportunities. Upon becoming economically strong, the Republic will strengthen its national sovereignty as well, Salinas de Gortari emphasised.

Gorbachev, Salinas Issue Joint Communiqué

PA0407170691 Mexico City NOTIMEX in Spanish
1532 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Report by envoy Mariana Pliego C.]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (NOTIMEX)—Mexico and the Soviet Union upheld today that to establish a new world

order, human interests and values should prevail, as well as the right of the people to elect their own path to development.

"The use of threats or force in relations between states must end, as well as any meddling in the domestic affairs of other countries," the two countries noted.

The USSR and Mexico warned of the costs and disadvantages of economic isolation and absolute sovereignty, and stated that present-day world circumstances demand that countries become incorporated in global trends, strengthening their productive apparatus through open policies that stimulate competition.

In a joint communique, the two governments also spoke out in favor of bolstering the efficiency of the United Nations and of solving political, economic, ecological, and humanitarian problems.

Salinas de Gortari and Mikhail Gorbachev agreed that the current international situation, which is characterized by positive changes, should be basically oriented toward seeking understanding and cooperation between countries. Only in this way, they said, should solutions to world problems and efforts aimed at supporting development be sought.

To this end, they stressed that the international community should bolster its efforts in favor of disarmament so as to free resources for development and maintain international peace and security.

In order to diversify and strengthen bilateral relations, the Mexican and USSR Governments agreed to begin negotiations for a general cooperation agreement to regulate economic, political, and commercial exchanges, among others.

They also committed themselves to promoting joint efforts to develop new forms of cooperation, including areas of production, the creation of mixed enterprises, compensation transactions, the exchange of technology, and development of interbanking reciprocity.

Also, they agreed to encourage cooperation in the different areas of applied science fundamentals, including the agricultural and forestry branches, energy sector, ecological preservation, chemistry, biology, mathematics, and seismology.

President Salinas expressed his country's wish to contribute toward reactivating the economies of Central and Eastern Europe, through joint actions with the European Reconstruction and Development Bank of which it is a part.

The Soviet Government expressed a profound interest in studying and learning firsthand of Mexico's experience in aspects involving the privatization of public enterprises. The two countries agreed to expand cooperation in this field.

Also, the two governments reiterated their interest in strengthening and diversifying the areas of economic cooperation in the region of the Pacific Basin. In this sense, Mexico supports the USSR's wish to join that forum.

During the various meetings held by the two state leaders, Salinas expressed his wish that the USSR will achieve success and "will continue to play a dynamic, original, and constructive role in the world scenario."

Salinas underlined the contributions of Gorbachev to the strengthening of peace and to the new climate of world detente and confidence among the peoples.

In conclusion, in the talks the Soviet president underscored the fact that in his country there is great sympathy and appreciation for the Mexican people, and he lauded Mexico's prominent and increasing role in the international field.

Gorbachev, Salinas Give Dinner Speeches

CM0708142591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jul 91 p 4

[TASS report: "In Line With Human Values"]

[Text] A dinner was given in the Great Kremlin Palace 4 July on behalf of Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR, in honor of Carlos Salinas de Gortari, president of the United Mexican States.

Present at the dinner from the Soviet side were Mikhail Gorbachev, Anatoliy Lukyanov and other officials. From the Mexican side—the officials accompanying the president of Mexico on his trip.

The USSR president spoke at the dinner.

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech.

Esteemed Mr. president!

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades!

Today is a significant day in the history of Soviet-Mexican relations. Personal contact has been resumed between the leadership of the two states at the highest level. In my opinion, it was fruitful and promising. We spoke about the changing world, about the role of Europe and Latin America in these changes, about the place of our countries in them, about the deep transformations which they are going through. Despite the great differences in the conditions and character of the processes of reform in Soviet and Mexican society, we found much that was useful in the exchange of experience and in the joint consideration of events in our two countries.

This, by the way, is additional evidence that the modern world is increasingly integral and interlinked. In it people's striving to build their lives according to common human values, with standards which meet universal interests and not just "their own" interests can be seen with increasing clarity.

People, wherever they live, in the eastern or western hemispheres, in the south or in the north, increasingly cherish freedom and democracy. People are learning to respect the rights of every individual, they value prosperity and sufficiency and the absence of conflicts and wars.

Today all of our thoughts and yours are about the present and the future. However, on such an occasion as the first meeting with the president of Mexico, it is worth saying a few words about our past relations too. Over a long period our countries have been linked by bonds of mutual interest, unchanging goodwill and benevolence. Our educated public knows Mexico quite well, its history and the ways and customs of its people. Mexico was the first in the western hemisphere to recognize the Soviet state.

The friendly response which our perestroika met with in Mexico is valued in the USSR. We know that the policy of modernizing Mexican society is frequently called "Salinasstroyka." We are pleased that the path chosen by Mexico has already enabled it to achieve a certain degree of success in the economic process and in the democratization of society.

Today Latin America, its states and peoples are seeking solutions to their long-standing and difficult problems along the paths of freedom of choice and national reconciliation. In this historic process Mexico is playing one of the chief roles. We note this and take account of it in our policy.

Esteemed Mr. President, I view positively the result of the talks which have taken place during your visit. A joint declaration has been adopted which sets out the proximity of our positions on major bilateral, regional and world problems. It determines the directions for the further development of Soviet-Mexican relations. Two agreements have been signed relating to dangers which affect not only the USSR and Mexico but also the whole international community. These are natural disasters and drug abuse. We have also created approaches for cooperation in space.

Mr. President, on your visit here in Moscow, you as it were embody Latin America. We note with satisfaction the raising of its role in world affairs, the deep progressive and democratic changes in a number of countries, the tendency toward national reconciliation in protracted conflicts for which your continent was noted for a long period.

We also value Latin America's aim to make more active use of the authority and potential of the United Nations. In this way to assist it in carrying out its prescribed functions, laid down originally by the founders of the United Nations—among whom are the USSR and Mexico—in the interests of peace, general security, the regulation of conflicts and the resolution of global issues. Included in this are also the problems of development and guaranteeing the integrity of the socioeconomic process.

People are becoming increasingly aware in the world that trouble in one part creates a threat to the whole. The deepening gulf in development and the dangerous situation in which many countries and whole regions have been left behind those which have surged ahead could disrupt or even overthrow everything positive which has been achieved in recent years in world politics.

Your visit, Mr. President, has confirmed and has allowed us to appreciate more specifically the closeness of our views on many things in the contemporary situation. This will make it easier for us to put our bilateral relations in order and will help, I think, to shed light and give more substance to the areas of cooperation which are most realistic at present.

Your health, Mr. President, and success to the reforms which are underway in Mexico and may the people of Mexico flourish!

The president of Mexico spoke in reply.

Speech by C. Salinas de Gortari.

Esteemed Mr president!

Ladies and gentlemen!

I am very glad of this opportunity to convey greetings and give expression to the friendship which the Mexican people have for the USSR. Our visit is taking place at a time of swift changes throughout the world. But this is also a time of hope for our peoples. The Mexican and Soviet peoples—each in their own conditions and in accordance with their history—have accepted the challenge of our epoch. They have set about making changes to preserve the values by which the peoples live, to better serve their well-being, and to play a constructive part in the new world order. No profound social change comes easily, just as the most cherished wishes of the peoples cannot be accomplished in a short space of time. But the indomitable character of our peoples, who cherish such aspirations, can be likened to "the breath of earth and destiny," as Boris Pasternak put it.

The world is no longer the same place it was only five years ago. The threat of total war is receding and opportunities for greater contacts than ever before are opening up. The language of cooperation has now displaced the language of confrontation. A step has been taken toward a new meeting, with the hope and uncertainty which are characteristic of freedom. The new regional alignments of forces have not yet managed to restructure their interests on the basis of respect for the rights of nations and recognition of the interests of neighbors. It is vitally necessary that international law, disarmament, cooperation and respect for sovereignty should prevail in all regions of the world.

Be that as it may, there is hope. There is the "common European home," which was conceived as a home for all the peoples between the Atlantic and the Urals—something which you, Mr. President, insisted on in Strasbourg in 1989. There are constructive tasks which

require an immediate solution in all latitudes. We are experiencing a period of unique and historic opportunity for the creation of a more just system of coexistence among peoples. Because of its energy and strength as a great country, which the USSR is, its voice will always carry weight, and therefore it can further the achievement of this noble objective. That is why it is so important to strengthen the united nations and to make its effectiveness the cornerstone of a new era of universal peace, based on law and reason, not on force.

The world economy is also very different from what it was. The achievements of science and technology bring changes on a world scale to the means of production and models of consumption. World politics has become an arena of tough and intensive competition and struggle for markets, for capital and for technology. Countries striving to ensure their competitiveness in the next century cannot afford to lag behind the dynamics of world development. If they are to survive in these new conditions, they need creative and effective forms of association both at home and abroad, while at the same time preserving all that is most valuable in the features of each society. This also calls for transformations in economic structures and openness to innovation, since we know that he who intends to close his doors to competition is risking his own future.

Mexico has made changes to its political practice and to its economic structures. Politically, democracy is being deepened and the coordination of action and the participation of ever broader sections of society in the country's political life is being expanded. At present we have legislation in the field of electoral law which has been approved by various parties, and an intensive political dialogue is underway on a national scale. In the economy we have set ourselves the aim of achieving stabilization and carrying out structural reform. We have lowered the level of inflation and opened our economy to external and internal competition. We have taken measures to stimulate investment and remove bureaucratic barriers. We have privatized state enterprises which are without strategic importance. But for us privatization is not an end in itself, but, in times such as these, it is a means of developing efficiency and full employment. Part of the proceeds of privatization goes to financing social programs which help to raise the standard of living. On the other hand the workers are co-owners of the privatized enterprises. In this way, a political consensus is created to support this strategy. At present our economy is once again growing, and for three years in succession this growth has exceeded demographic growth.

Internal efforts must find a path to the outside world if they are to bear fruit. To achieve this, we have resorted to vigorous diversification of our economic relations with foreign countries.

Mexico has made contacts with the European Community and Asian countries of the Pacific Ocean basin; it is in favor of agreements with the countries of Latin America and at the present time is conducting talks on

concluding a trilateral agreement on free trade with the United States and Canada. We are also striving for rapprochement with the USSR and holding a political dialogue at a higher level and broadening mutual exchanges. Our links with the integration zones do not exclude an intensification of relations with such countries as your great power.

There are no changes more important and complicated than those aimed at changing mentalities and not just material results. In our case the decisive factor in these changes consists of adopting such political agreements which allow sufficient time so that the reforms can produce positive results, and not collapse because of the justified impatience of the people. So the will for changes is taking on a universal nature and is merging into a single channel, and the population is changing from passive observer into the main hero of the changes.

Only constant and stubborn political work in the process of changes can prepare the ground for the creation of a production base with the aim of ensuring a growth in public well-being and the creation of conditions for the broadening of social justice. Only policies based on firm conviction and readiness for dialogue can lead to the necessary talks to see the reforms through to the end and avoid a situation when unfulfilled promises or the delay of results can arouse displeasure and the justified expression of public concern. Talks are necessary to close the road to the temptation to return to previous times no matter how bad they were, or to begin to change everything no matter how risky this turns out.

When the world fights for its future marked with major and not always clear changes, there is no place for pseudo-reforms or insignificant deals. Now is the time of profound changes aimed at strengthening the nation and not tearing it to pieces so that the production results are sufficient to be competitive abroad and adequate inside the country. Therefore the successful implementation of the changes is necessary conditional on talented political leadership.

The technocrats can develop a draft for these changes, a modernized bureaucracy can become an instrument to implement them, but a politician must lead them, and only a genuine politician can implement them successfully.

Political reform does not require economic reform as an indispensable preliminary condition, but it is difficult to conduct political transformations if there is not a stable and effective production base which corresponds materially to the hopes aroused by the political changes. The will of the government alone is insufficient to guarantee the conditions when pluralism creates a new political culture. It requires conscious efforts to create it, and also a civil society which will fulfill its part of the work with full responsibility. It is insufficient to just demand the observation of one's rights but it is also necessary to fulfill one's duties. Otherwise the threat of anarchy and destabilization arises. The seventies in Mexico were marked

by the process of the switch to pluralism and glasnost in the power structures: this was genuine political reform. Now, in the nineties, with a broadening of democracy we are implementing an economic reform which will lead us onto a new level of well-being. At the present time in Mexico the political and economic reforms are constant and simultaneous processes.

In the complicated processes of transformations culture played a prominent role in supporting the integration of Mexico, and consequently was a corner stone ensuring the stability of the main values in the process of changes. Our culture allows us to be Mexicans, to change and remain Mexicans. The strength of our culture has always made us receptive to world values, open to dialogue and mutual exchange, and at the present time it gives us the confidence to participate in the great universal transformation while preserving our own characteristics. For this reason our culture is not a part of the frozen past or a moment which dissolves in time. It stands before us in the form of links of one chain which represent the expression of our freedoms, link us with our 3,000 year history, draw a single future for us in our imagination, and become a condition for transforming the changes into an instrument, and not the final goal which is most important for us: Our genuine "I" and our characteristic perception of freedom.

We in Mexico recognize the force of the ideas and the value of the persistence that are embodied in the words "perestroika" and "glasnost." They reflect a gaze that is fixed on the future and which has inspired the efforts of your great people and awakened its unbounded imagination. "Perestroika" and "glasnost" speak the language of the present day, but, at the same time, acknowledge the significance of the past. We feel a natural affection for the word "change," since we ourselves are carrying out profound transformations.

The world has a high regard for the political skill with which one of the most difficult processes of transformations that have ever taken place is being managed here. The achievement of freedom and justice does not presuppose the presence of ready-made recipes and easy roads; what is needed here is determination, a clear vision of the future and, at the same time, the ability to correctly find one's bearings in the present and the capacity to avoid conflict and to stimulate feelings of duty; also necessary are trust and respect for people and whole communities. We see in you, Mr. President, the statesman who initiated the renewal of a power as great as the USSR and thus provided the stimulus for transformation throughout the world. The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to you is welcomed by millions of people in many countries. We Mexicans, Mr. President, subscribe to this high appraisal of your merits.

Mexican-Soviet friendship was firmly established in the period of our two great revolutions, the first revolutions this century. Since each of them was marked by a particular historical originality, both of our revolutions sought to achieve both justice and freedom. In the early twenties, our

governments exchanged diplomatic representatives, the exchange was the first recognition on the American continent of the new Soviet state. The ties uniting us are founded on respect for the deeds and for the 1,000 years of history that give us the right to a place in the history of mankind. Now they determine our optimistic view of the future. Today it is becoming possible, thanks to a dialogue that is already gazing at the realities of the 21st century, to broaden our knowledge of one another and the mutual exchange between our countries.

This land gave birth to the genius of Pushkin and Gogol, Dostoyevski and Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky and Shostakovich. We admire all the powerful manifestation of the creativity of the Soviet people, which has given so much to world culture. Our culture is a culture of millennia that supports and strengthens our new line of conduct toward ourselves and toward the whole world. More frequent contacts between our governments and especially between our countries' representatives enable us to get to know one another better and to maintain a lasting friendship and mutual exchange. One popular Soviet song tells splendidly of a traveler heading for the horizon of tomorrow without losing sight of the only reliable road. That thought precisely reflects the moods that are common to our two peoples.

I invite everyone to drink a toast to the prosperity of the Soviet Union, to friendship and cooperation between our peoples, and to the health and prosperity of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The dinner passed off in a friendly atmosphere.

Assessing the situation in the country, the USSR president stressed: The moment has now come when it is possible and necessary to move more decisively. We must not remain in a transitional phase, in a state of some kind of "air turbulence." Society cannot withstand that. We have to protect our chosen course against both hotheads and those who are nostalgic for the past. The formula of public accord which we have put forward is the one which matches most closely our national interests, and is in keeping with the public mood. Of course, we have not emerged from the state of crisis, but the first elements of stability have already appeared. The "Nine plus One" agreement played a most important part in this.

Naturally, the main burden will rest on us, but we need interaction on some points. I do not mean charity, but cooperation on a mutually beneficial basis. It must be hoped that the leaders of the West will have enough wisdom and imagination to weigh all this. It is very important that the situation should not get out of control and that perestroika should advance. Agreeing with Mikhail Gorbachev, the Mexican president noted that now is the hour of the politicians, not the traders.

The USSR president stressed the trust and cordiality which have long been characteristic of Soviet-Mexican relations. Mexico should know that it has many reliable friends in the Soviet Union, and that this is a tradition which has laid down deep roots.

Salinas de Gortari stated that he very highly values the wide range and depth of the discussion which has taken place. He spoke about the destinies of our peoples and of mankind, he said, as if summing up the philosophy and content of the conversation. Enlarged Soviet-Mexican talks were also held. Taking part on the Soviet side were A.A. Bessmertnykh, K.F. Katushev, V.Ye. Orlov, O.N. Shishkin, V.N. Ignatenko, K.N. Brutents, V.D. Nikolayenko, Yu.M. Khilchevskiy, and O.T. Darusenkov. Taking part on the Mexican side were F. Solana, S. Gonzalez, C. Tello, P. Aspe, K. Sierra, K. Cordoba, O. Granados, A. Rosental, K. Martinez, A. Gerard, and K. Ceja.

Gorbachev-Salinas Talks, Results

CM0708145991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1,4

[TASS Report: "Meeting Between Soviet and Mexican Presidents"]

[Text] A meeting was held 4 July between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Carlos Salinas de Gortari, the president of the United Mexican States. Right from the start it developed into a broad and committed exchange of views, which was held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cordiality. The talks were dominated by the major changes in the international arena, which have led the world to a new condition, and which needs to be evaluated and made the object of serious practical conclusions.

Mikhail Gorbachev particularly singled out the improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, which have now probably achieved an unprecedented level of development, particularly as far as mutual trust is concerned. The Soviet Union has drawn a fundamental conclusion about the need for a consistent line on cooperation with the United States based on a balance of interests. The U.S. leadership has not succumbed to pressure from those forces which, exploiting a wave of military euphoria after the events in the Persian Gulf, have striven to call into question the importance of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Profound changes have taken place in Europe. The Asian continent has begun to move toward healing the situation. If you add the tempestuous processes in Latin America, then it is obvious that a new and highly promising stage in international relations has begun. The leaders of states are increasingly coming to understand that all the peoples and all countries, despite their differences, belong to a single, common civilization. But what has been achieved so far is too fragile and the time for triumphant fanfares has not arrived. Everywhere—in the USSR, in the United States, in Western Europe, and in NATO—there are opponents as well as supporters of the changes.

The whole world is in need of perestroika, although certain people in the West believe that it is only the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe that should change. Everyone needs to learn to respect freedom of choice and not to impose their model of development. Everyone

also needs to ponder their moves with the interests of others in mind. It is important to create new institutions—both at the United Nations and in regional contexts—for influencing processes which are taking place. New forces of cooperation are especially necessary. It is with precisely this philosophy in mind, Mikhail Gorbachev said, that I am going to London.

The presidents noted that there is much in common in the tasks and methods of reform in their two countries. Explaining his lively interest in Soviet perestroika, Salinas de Gortari expressed the conviction that unless it is successful, a new world order is impossible. What is happening in the Soviet Union has a most profound effect on the entire world.

Touching on the issue of privatization, both presidents expressed the view that it must not be carried out by the "shock therapy" method, but must develop gradually and through definite stages. Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the laws passed in the USSR provide for pluralism of forms of ownership. The former practice of establishing a priori proportions for the various sectors is divorced from real life. This will determine the very development of market relations. One cannot just use coercive methods; freedom of choice must be guaranteed.

We are asked what, then, will become of the socialist idea. In ensuring political pluralism, glasnost, and developing democracy, creating a mixed economy, and building a state which regulates social relations in the interest of all citizens, are we not moving toward the realization of that idea, which expresses the desire for a better life, greater social justice, and freedom? I agree with the argument of the recent session of the council of interaction in Prague that neither socialism nor capitalism has so far proved capable of solving mankind's problems. We are clearly heading for a new civilization, one that will not have any single model. After all, even the children of the same mother are not identical. Different traditions, national specifics, and the nature of societies with their culture and potential—these are what determine specific paths and models.

Gorbachev Bids Goodbye To Mexican President

LD0407214191 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT
4 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS—A joint Soviet-Mexican declaration was adopted here today upon the conclusion of talks between the presidents of the USSR and Mexico. The declaration will be published in the press.

Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari met later with USSR people's deputies—members of parliamentary committees and commissions.

The official ceremony of seeing the Mexican president off was held in St. George's Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace in the evening. Mikhail Gorbachev warmly said good-bye to the Mexican president.

Supreme Soviet

Fundamentals of Foreign Investment Law Adopted

LD0507145991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] The fundamentals of the legislation on foreign investment in the USSR were adopted today by the country's Supreme Soviet. Almost all members of parliament supported this legal act which, in their opinion, in a package with other laws will help the Soviet economy to avoid a catastrophe in getting out of the crisis. The results of the voting showed that the overwhelming majority of parliamentarians shared this point of view. A total of 340 deputies voted for the adoption of the law, 11 were against, and 11 abstained.

This legal act grants foreign investors a national regime, that is no less favorable legal conditions compared with Soviet enterprises, and contains an extensive system of guarantees for foreign capital investments. In accordance with this law, on the territory of the USSR it is permitted to set up an enterprise with 100 percent foreign participation. Envisaged in particular is the granting to foreign investors of concessions on the exploitation of natural resources. The law grants foreign investors the right of export and to import without a licence, and exempts them from customs duties on imports and taxes on exports.

During the article by article discussion of the law the deputies introduced quite a few amendments into the draft. In the main they were dictated by the striving of the parliamentarians to fully combine the necessary protection of national interests with this law, and a striving to guarantee foreign investors' complete security for their investments.

Lukyanov Unwilling To Discuss NKAO

LD0607173191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] Today the union parliament continued its work at a joint session of chambers. The desire to conclude the discussion of questions included in the present session's agenda forced the deputies to hold a session on a Saturday as well.

Several deputies wanted to expand the agenda of today's session. Because of the escalation of the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] it was proposed that the issue of the NKAO should be reexamined. After deputies from Armenia and Azerbaijan had expressed their assessments of the events, the chairman assured the Supreme Soviet that everything possible is being done to normalize the situation, and appealed to deputies not to exacerbate the atmosphere around this

issue. Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov expressed condolences to those who suffered as a result of the natural disaster that hit Moldova. [passage omitted]

Human Rights Acts Ratified

LD0507191491 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 5 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—The Soviet parliament ratified today four international human rights acts. It adopted resolutions on the Soviet Union's joining the optional protocol to the International Pact on Civil Political Rights, on recognising the competence of the Human Rights Committee in accordance with Article 41 of the International Pact on Civil Political Rights, on recognising the competence of the Committee for Eradication of Racial Discrimination in accordance with Article 14 of the International Convention on the Eradication of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, on lifting the reservation concerning Article 20 and on recognising the competence of the anti-torture committee in accordance with Articles 21 and 22 of the convention against torture and other cruel, inhuman and humiliating types of treatment and punishment.

Draft Law on Trademarks Approved

LD0307125991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet approved at its joint session today the draft law on trade marks in its first reading.

The parliamentarians are also expected to discuss today two other draft laws from the package that forms the legal basis of a market economy. This is a law on administrative responsibility for disruption of production and the basic provisions of antimonopoly legislation.

Yazov, Ryzhkov Named in Privilege Report

LD0707092791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer Kulikov] Today is Saturday, but in spite of that the union parliament worked, and worked quite intensively. The reason is that it is necessary to complete, by 12 July, the discussion of the issues included in the agenda of the fifth session.

Today's morning sitting started on a sad note. The deputies were discussing another bloody round of the interethnic drama in Nagorno-Karabakh. Deputies from Armenia and Azerbaijan spoke, each of whom introduced his own point of view, which, as you understand, did not coincide with the opinion of the opposite party. After some debate, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov summed up the discussion of this issue and assured the Supreme Soviet that everything possible is being done to

normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. He appealed to the deputies not to heat up the atmosphere around this issue. Then the work on the agenda started. [passage omitted]

At the evening meeting, Kozyrev, deputy chairman of the Commission on Benefits and Privileges, made a report.

[Begin Kozyrev recording] [passage omitted] In connection with the violation of the demands of Article 121 of the USSR Constitution, the commission introduces for discussion by the Supreme Soviet the question of personal responsibility of Comrade Yazov, Minister of Defense; and Comrade (Prostyakov), administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers. In the commission's opinion, refusal to give information, hampering the work of a Supreme Soviet body and giving it false information are sufficient grounds for a principled appraisal of these actions by the Supreme Soviet. The commission suggests that the Supreme Soviet should examine the activities of the former chairman of the Council of Ministers, Comrade Ryzhkov, who gave his personal permission and took a direct part in selling state property at token prices; this happened and is still happening.

The commission suggests that the USSR president should examine the question of retirement for Comrades Shkabardnya and Voronin, who are currently employed by the diplomatic service. The commission suggests that, at the end of the current session, the prime minister should make a report on the cases of abuse of power which have been revealed, and that proposals be made on the use of aircraft belonging to civil aviation, as well as of the state summer housing fund. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Kulikov] Comrade Lukyanov summed up the results of the discussion. Five committees and commissions were instructed to finalize the resolution on this issue, taking into consideration the deputies' proposals, and to adopt it before the end of the summer session. And I should like to remind you that the union parliament is taking a recess in a week's time. [passage omitted]

Draft Law on Political Prisoners Viewed

OW0807045691 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1930 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The draft law "On rehabilitation of political reprisals victims and procedures for restoring them to their full rights" was submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet on Friday. The draft was Prepared by the Committee on law and order with participation of the Supreme Court, the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the Interior Ministry and the KGB.

The draft envisages rehabilitation of "all not rehabilitated earlier persons subjected to groundless reprisals in the period from 1920 to 1959 on social, class, national religious and political bases".

It is also planned to rehabilitate those sentenced on political charges 1960-1988 which were lifted later by the following legislation, as well as those placed by decisions of court on mental hospitals for forced treatment.

The draft will restore persons groundlessly deprived of USSR citizenship and those expelled from the Soviet Union by political reasons to their full rights.

Experimental Penal Legislation Approved

LD0507183191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1326 GMT 4 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Petukhov]

[Text] Moscow, 4 July (TASS)—Fundamentally new methods for social work with prisoners are contained in the decision "On the conduct of an experiment on the use of new forms of correction and social adaptation of convicts" which has been adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The experiment is based on further humanization of the conditions in which sentences are served, and on a differentiated effect on convicts, bearing in mind their personalities and degree of correction. That was the comment made on the new document today, in an interview with a TASS correspondent, by Major-General Vladimir Gulyayev, head of the Correctional Affairs Main Administration of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD].

The carrying out of the experiment, in the devising of which advanced international experience was used, will take place for two years in several detention centers in Chimkent Oblast (Kazakhstan). In effect, the very approach toward implementing criminal punishment in the USSR is changing, the general said. Thus, offenders who have firmly embarked on the road of correction and who have served at least half of their sentence may, by decision of the administration, be transferred out of the colonies into conditions closely resembling freedom. In the view of the MVD representative, this is very important, "since convicts who have embarked on correction come under pressure from criminal groupings in the camps".

Measures are envisaged to enhance the effectiveness of the correction of offenders, the general noted. This is to be achieved by strengthening convicts' ties with their families, relatives and colleagues at their former place of work.

Touching on the talks on the Union treaty that are now going on, Vladimir Gulyayev spoke highly of the inclusion in its draft of an article on the need to set up federal law enforcement agencies and the coordination of their

activities with the law enforcement agencies of the republics. He also declared himself to favor retaining a single regime for correctional establishments in all the republics. Vladimir Gulyayev noted with satisfaction that "businesslike cooperation between the law enforcement agencies of all the republics is still being maintained".

Supreme Soviet 3 July Session

LD0307221491

[Editorial report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1818 GMT on 3 July carries the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 3 July. Reception is good.

At 1818 GMT the announcer says that the discussion of laws on industrial samples and trademarks was concluded at today's sitting. The industrial samples law was given a first reading; further work is to be done in committees. The trademark law passed on the first reading with the decision to implement it. The morning sitting also passed a law on personal name changes. Yanayev's request to resign as a deputy was granted. Other deputies' requests were also approved.

At 2021 GMT the afternoon sitting begins with a discussion of the basic principles of antimonopoly legislation. The floor is given to First Deputy Prime Minister Shcherbakov. Shcherbakov says that the Marxist notion of specialized production has become distorted. All production in the USSR is monopolized. In other countries, 70 percent is the figure which triggers antimonopoly legislation. The key task is to regulate conduct by producers in the market. The basic principles involved in this legislation are designed to regulate conduct in the Union-wide market, while republics are left to regulate activity on their own territory.

This assumes, Shcherbakov continues, that republics will indeed have their own antimonopoly legislation, as Russia already has. There are no great differences between the Russian law and the planned Union legislation. Antimonopoly law has to be based on what is forbidden, rather than what is permitted, but this must not stand in the way of initiative.

At 2035 GMT Shcherbakov talks about provisions designed to prevent producers from using shortages to drive up prices. He lists other prohibited practices, such as poaching other trademarks and discriminatory activities, and cites penalties provided for these in the law.

He compares the planned law with antimonopoly legislation in other countries: Japan extends it to trade unions, but the Soviet law will be confined to economic activity. The proportion of market domination required to trigger legal sanctions also differs from country to country.

At 2043 GMT Shcherbakov summarizes other provisions of the law. Its purpose is to lay down principles and approaches to guide people in specific cases. The law has been agreed with the republics, and there are no differences of principle with them, except that some republics want to forbid the removal of goods from a republic without the approval of that republic's government. Shcherbakov says that the law has been submitted by the government, on instructions from the Congress of People's Deputies.

At 2048 GMT Lukyanov invites questions for Shcherbakov. Deputy Grishchenko asks what social guarantees are planned for monopoly producers which are forced to cut production and lay off workers. Shcherbakov says the law's provisions envisage no negative effects for employees.

Deputy Grishchuk complains about increased costs of equipment for farmers. Shcherbakov talks generally about compensation for damage done by monopoly producers. Deputy (?Savvin) asks about price differences between the town and the countryside. Shcherbakov replies briefly.

At 2055 GMT the announcer summarizes other contributions to the debate. The decision is made to give the bill a first reading, then to present it to the Supreme Soviet after examination by committee. The parliament will work in committees tomorrow. The next joint sitting will be held on Friday.

Supreme Soviet 5 July Session

LD0507202191

[Editorial report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1840 GMT on 5 July carries the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 5 July. Reception is good.

At 1841 GMT the announcer says the union parliament debated foreign investments and passed the main points of draft law

At 1842 GMT (Tabeyev), deputy chairman of the Committee for International Affairs, speaks on privatization and related matters. Foreign investment is increasing. The draft law deals with rights of foreign investors. Details of the bill are provided: a new article enables foreign investors to take part in privatization. Suggested changes to wording of particular articles are outlined.

At 1852 GMT (Tabeyev) continues listing suggested changes to individual articles.

At 1858 GMT the announcer says comments were then made by (Yakubov) of the Committee for Construction. He emphasizes the need for the fundamental legislation to be passed, given the current confused situation with some republics having already passed laws permitting

foreign investment. His committee therefore recommends that the bill be passed in outline. At the same time there remain details in individual articles which require further debate. He wells on some of the taxation and auditing aspects of the provisions.

At 1909 GMT video shows brief clips of several other speakers, as voice-over summarizes their comments. A resolution putting the law into effect was passed.

The Supreme Soviet also ratified four international acts, including on human rights and, racial discrimination. As the session is drawing to a close and there remains business to be concluded, the house will meet tomorrow, Saturday, the announcer concludes.

Supreme Soviet 6 July Session

LD0607191391

[Editorial report] Moscow Central Television Second Program

in Russian at 1730 GMT on 6 July carries the 25-minute "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on the proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 6 July.

The announcer begins by saying that today's meeting was a special session, held to get to extra business. The main business concerned scientific policy, but some deputies called for the agenda to be expanded to include discussion of the Nagorno-Karabakh situation. Lukyanov explains that everything possible is being done.

At 1730 GMT a debate on scientific policy starts. The first speaker is (Valeriy Mikhaylov), first deputy chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, who notes that the USSR has much to offer in the field of scientific research and that the bill is needed to put scientific work on a juridical footing. A unified scientific space needs to be created. The bill underlines the role individual republics can play, in conjunction with the union authorities. It also makes provision for democratizing the management of scientific policy and making it answerable to the Supreme Soviet. And the bill emphasizes the importance of the individual creative scientific specialist and the need to give him full support. It further seeks to ensure that Soviet scientific work is slotted into the international system of scientific work.

The next speaker shown is Nikolay Karlov, deputy chairman of the Science and Technology Committee. He describes the bill as "declarative" in nature, though he thinks this is unavoidable. He picks out some especially notable points in the bill - the definition of the roles of the republics and the union, the juridical formulation of the notion of expert opinion, the emphasis it gives to the role of the Supreme Soviet in monitoring the financing of scientific activity.

The announcer says 13 deputies spoke in all, then the bill was passed in its first reading and sent off for further work in committees and commissions.

The next debate was the agricultural situation and the need for extra measures to ensure the gathering of the harvest. Deputy Veprev, chairman of the Agrarian Issues and Food Committee who is shown citing some grain yield figures for particular parts of the country, then citing some local financial and administrative problems affecting delivery of agricultural produce in, for instance, Krasnoyarsk Kray. Agriculture is the sole sphere which can guarantee that the country is saved from the crisis, from disintegration, yet not enough is being actually done.

Lukyanov comments on a proposed resolution calling on the government to expedite arrangements for the harvest, suggesting some rewording. The wording is agreed and the resolution is passed by 337 votes to 0.

The announcer goes on to say that later in the day a report was heard from the commission on privileges, delivered by deputy Kozyrev, deputy chairman of the commission, who is shown speaking. He referred to instances of official misuse of transport and dachas. A series of brief clips is shown of other speakers, including Akhromeyev, some of whom take issue with points made in the report. It was decided to refer back the proposed decision for further consideration and resubmit it next week.

The announcer concludes by saying that the next sitting continues on Monday 8 July.

TASS Rounds Up Session

LD0607202591 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—The Soviet parliament approved today after first reading the draft law on state scientific and technological policy.

According to Valeriy Mikhailov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology who presented the document, "this act creates a general legal framework for the development of national science and technology. The attitude of the state to science and scientific workers is recorded in the law for the first time in the history of this country."

The law says that it is planned to create on Soviet territory a single scientific and technological space. All republics will take part in drawing up all-Union priority programmes of scientific development, and allocations for them will be approved by the federal parliament. The law stresses that the volume of allocations for these purposes should grow steadily from one year to the next and should not be smaller than the fixed share of the gross national product. The share will be determined by the legislators during the finishing of the draft law.

Members of the federal parliament discussed the situation in the agricultural sector today. Arkadiy Veprev, chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Agrarian

Policy, said that in the southern regions of the country grain yield is smaller, than in 1990, by 500 kg per hectare on the average, including in the Russian Federation—by 1,300 kg and in Kazakhstan—by 200 kg. At the same time, in the Ukraine the yield is 40 kg higher than last year. The federal parliament adopted a resolution on ensuring the timely and effective harvesting. Specifically, it instructed the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers, republican governments and local authorities to work out an effective compensation mechanism regulating the participation of urban dwellers in the harvesting campaign.

The legislators discussed a report of the Parliamentary Commission on Privileges.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed on Contacts With West

LD0607014891 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 2140 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Interview with President M.S. Gorbachev by an unidentified correspondent at the Kiev airport following his talks with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl on 5 July—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, two questions. First, in a few days you are leaving for London where there are going to be meetings with the leaders of the seven leading countries in the world. It is known that you are a convinced supporter of the expansion of contacts with the West on an equal footing. Of course, it is difficult now to predict the results of these conversations, talks, naturally, but, in your view, what effect could our country expect in the near future from the expansion of contacts with the world community?

[Gorbachev] You know, I am primarily an adherent of the following approach, where one approaches this very large issue seriously, realistically, without any sensations.

I think that what we have gone through during the years of perestroika and the application of new thinking in foreign policy has created such a situation in the world. Improvement is taking place, rapprochement. A political dialogue is proceeding. At present a situation has arisen where we have a right to put the question of this growing political dialogue, and political process on a world scale, being based on firm and new economic relations. This is the plan.

What do I mean by new economic relations with the developed countries of the West? This is the organic inclusion of the economy of the Soviet Union in world economic relations. It is a question of a decent system of cooperation on the basis of commonly adopted rules having to replace mere trade, the mere implementation of individual projects. For this we, primarily, have to

change and reorganize our economy on market principles on the basis of the reformation of relations of ownership and progression toward varied forms of economic operation, the setting up of a market infrastructure. Naturally, everything that concerns the financial system, the ruble and its convertibility, well, and the development of our production potential, so that it can offer this economy new goods, not only energy resources, but also that relating to other sectors of the economy.

This is our destiny, our responsibility, our burden, and we must, first and foremost, largely solve it on our own. On the other hand, they on the other side must also change and understand that we are already in a different situation. This must be realized by everybody. It is very important. Therefore, we are now all conducting intensive talks, at the level of the Union as well as with the participation of all our republics—and you see that contacts are also developing on that level and this is another characteristic feature of the moment. This is all good. This has given us a chance to understand the meaning of what we want.

So, what we want is...[changes thought] we understand that the responsibility for reforms, for changes, for how to conduct them, is our responsibility. It is our burden which we must carry ourselves. But, we think that cooperation with the West could be a very significant component here in the opening up of new...[changes thought] in implementing large-scale projects to do with power engineering, the oil industry, road transport, the agrarian sector, the food industry, and light industry—and others as well. Who can name them all? I could get carried away now and name many. For example, we were talking...[changes thought] here in the Ukraine they are implementing—how many programs did you say; large-scale ones with foreign countries?

[Unidentified speaker] With the FRG along, we have 30 such projects.

[Gorbachev] You see on what scale it is being done?

[Speaker] Demilitarizing....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] Yes, exactly. Therefore, this is what it is all about: about raising our economic cooperation to a new level according to the general rules of the game. When there is all this talk—speculative, demagogical, well, so to speak, in the interests of some political calculations—we should not pay any attention to any of this. We are talking about normal cooperation which can only be normal if it is mutually beneficial. That is all. I think the discussion we had here is very important. This is our important partner. The Germans are in a very constructive mood as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. We can see here a wish to increase this cooperation. They understand the significance of the Soviet Union—an enormous power with a huge potential, and not just natural potential, but also scientific, industrial, and intellectual potential—joining together. They understand what it means. Perhaps, understand it better than

many, and appreciate it. In this respect they have been a very interesting partner. We talked very well.

[Unidentified speaker] We hope, it will remain so.

[Gorbachev] I hope that actually there is a tradition here, and some kind of mutual complement. Then, you know, politicians in the Soviet Union and the politicians in today's Germany also have a lesson in history of a hard period, so that it should not be forgotten, this drama, a terrible period in our relations. So, today everything must be done so that these two states, the peoples of these countries, can get close to each other and cooperate, both in their own interests and in the interests of Europe and the world.

[Correspondent] A second question, Mikhail Gorbachev, we cannot get around it now. Your stay in Kiev began with a conversation with the leaders of the Ukraine. For this reason, it would probably be very interesting for television viewers to know your opinion on the new republican anti-crisis program, the situation surrounding the signing of the Union treaty, and in general how you see the role of the Ukraine in the union of sovereign republics?

[Gorbachev] I have long had connections with the Ukraine. I know it well, its people, its potential—both productive and scientific. I know many of the cadres. Matters are conducted thoroughly here. They are trying now to keep this situation in check, although, let us speak frankly, winds are blowing in the Ukraine as well and there are probably waves too. Is that not so? I am asking the chairman a question directly.

[Vitol'd Pavlovich Fokin, chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Presidium] From the right, from the left, and from the center, Mikhail Sergeyevich. It blows everywhere.

[Gorbachev] You know it is so. I would put it like this. Today's conversation—we conversed for one hour and a half together—it shows that we understand one another, understand our goals, understand the steps we must take. The main thing is that there is understanding on the part of the whole Ukrainian leadership. If one takes into account the fact that there was a referendum of the whole people of the Ukraine, then there are very sound roots here for the strengthening of our federation. Well, the Ukrainians are active supporters of the renewal of the federation and I should say that in this sense we should here speak about the following. It is very important here that we, in moving away from one extreme, that of bureaucratic centralization—and this still remains, Comrade Fokin especially is constantly complaining about the center. Well, I understand because the government most often has to...[changes thought] but all the same the process of decentralization, of the transfer of functions, has begun and is underway and it needs to be finished within the framework and on the basis of those provisions on which we do agree, already on the basis of a new treaty which is now at its completion stage. There is understanding here. I am a staunch supporter of this

process ensuing in precisely this way. I am against the disintegration of the Union. This would be a drama that would wipe everything out and would simply destroy our society and would set all of our peoples back by many years. There is understanding here. The Ukraine, the issue of the Union is not being called into question in the Ukraine. What is being called into question is how it is to work, how to obtain a document which will meet contemporary demands and today I was convinced of this, having listened to all the leaders of the republic.

But I wanted, and I said this to my old friends—they are all my friends, I cannot use another word, I believe in them all—that we cannot fall into the other extreme, when we cross the line which will destroy the natural ties which exist in the economy, human ties and so on. So we have returned to the Ukraine and looked. Listen, it is connected to the whole country, even with the world. How many people live here? How many intermingled fates are there? Therefore, we all understand that the Ukraine just as it has taken shape, been formed, must receive new possibilities in the Union, receive oxygen and develop and have input into all-union affairs, and cooperate with other peoples. There is this understanding, once there is this principled understanding, all individual problems will be solved. I am convinced of this. I proceed from this.

[Correspondent] Thank you, Mikhail Sergeyevich. Excuse us for having detained you before your flight. I wish you a happy return to Moscow.

[Gorbachev] Okay. We, I, thank you in front of our television viewers, before the leaders of the Ukraine, hospitable Kiev, and the citizens who showed us hospitality. We worked well here.

[Correspondent] Thank you.

Gorbachev Suspends Resolution To Resolve Conflict

PM0507213491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "How the President Resolved a Conflict Between Two Premiers"]

[Text] Yesterday evening I. Silayev, head of the Russian Government, made a press statement at a news conference in the "White House" on the embankment [RSFSR Supreme Soviet building]. The Russian premier denied accusations leveled against him by Yu. Mikhaylov, leader of the USSR Prime Minister's Press Service (see PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for 3 July).

The conflict between the Union and Russian governments centers on USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution 360, which, in the opinion of the republics, significantly infringes their economic autonomy and is contrary to the spirit and letter of the joint action program.

The position adopted by President Gorbachev is characteristic. He adopted a decision suspending "Resolution 360" until such time as all contradictions with the joint action program have been removed.

Secretariat Urges Legislation on Economic Crime

LD0707214491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1244 GMT 7 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 7 Jul (TASS)—Progress toward a civilized market system requires a resolute strengthening of legality, law and order, and total observance of current norms under the constitution. This is the view of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. A decision adopted on the need to strengthen the campaign against crimes in the economic sphere notes that infringements of the law in this area have now penetrated all branches of the national economy, and primarily those which are concerned with meeting vitally important consumer requirements. Corruption, bribery, and extortion are spreading while organized crime, smuggling, and illegal currency transactions are occurring on an ever grander scale. Illegal activities of this kind go on under the cover of various cooperative and other non-state structures. The number of mafia groups is on the increase.

The development of negative processes in the economy is a consequence of the destruction of economic and interregional ties, and the unified finance and banking system. It also stems from a ubiquitous weakening of state and departmental control over the work of economic subunits. The activities of certain management bodies, both at the center and in the localities, and of many republican, kray, and oblast power structures, have only a slight influence, sometimes even a destructive influence, on the economy. The artificial division of the economic zone, dictated by monopolistic producers, and the distortion of the principles of free trade through the introduction of assorted restrictions have a demoralizing influence on workers at all levels.

The decision by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat particularly notes the danger of increased merging between the state and economic apparatus and organized crime. The new commercial banks are virtually outside state control. In making numerous large financial and credit transactions with state, cooperative, and joint enterprises, they commit crude violations of current legislation and normative acts. This also applies to conducting currency transactions, which causes significant damage to the economy.

In the current acute socioeconomic situation, the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat considers it necessary to implement a range of measures to stop economic crime. Party committees and organizations are called upon to base their day to day activities on the fact that the Communist Party rigorously advocates a high moral standard, discipline, and order in society, as well as the eradication of conditions which are conducive to growth in bad management, abuses, and crimes.

In order to create the necessary legal basis for the campaign against crime, the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat calls for the intensive adoption of legislation aimed at bringing legal practice into line with the current situation in the economy. Raising the prestige of law enforcement bodies and of the profession of workers who guard law and order in the country and the peace of its citizens demands unremitting concern and attention. Party committees must resolutely defend workers in the militia, state security, the courts, and the prosecutor's office. They must energetically promote the improvement of their professional skills, the enhancement of their living and material conditions, and work through communist deputies toward the adoption of legislation on compulsory insurance for workers in the prosecutor's office and the courts in order to safeguard the social protection of workers in the law enforcement bodies.

Party Official on Shevardnadze Investigation

LD0407154291 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1451 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jul (TASS)—As is well known, after the statement by Eduard Shevardnadze in Vienna on his intention to establish a new public-political structure, the CPSU Central Control Commission started a party investigation in relation to the former minister of foreign affairs.

Yevgeniy Makhov, chairman of the Central Control Commission, who has been carrying out this duty, told a TASS correspondent: "We are waiting for the reaction of the primary party organization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and we will take actions on the basis of its decision."

The party investigation will be settled in this way, the chairman confirmed.

Democratic Reformist Group Statement Criticized

PM0807102991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 5 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Litov: "Comments of a Diehard Conservative: Will They Manage To Get on 'Noah's Ark'?"]

[Text] The long-awaited, but still sensational statement issued by E. Shevardnadze, A. Yakovlev, A. Sobchak, G. Popov, and other "reformist" figures about their intention to set up a United Democratic Party has made them into instant heroes of the day. This new political organization, reported the "democratic" press, overcome with delight, should be able "in union with the mass populist party of Travkin to 'siphon off' the maximum CPSU personnel (thereby crowning the Democratic Platform's bid)."

That assessment is, it has to be acknowledged, completely accurate. The Democratic Platform has indeed tried to burst the Communist Party asunder. Initially from within, and then, when it did not work, from

without, drawing its own "intellectual leaders" from it. Then, finally, the Platform really did succeed in weakening a party already undermined by the antipeople and sometimes openly antiparty policy of its leadership through the combined forces of those "leaders" and the dregs of the party made up of timeserving careerists and pococurantist philistines with party membership cards who sympathize with it. But its complete destruction on the pattern of the East European countries did not ensue. The ship, steered onto reefs by unskilled pilots and sustaining several very dangerous holes, and, moreover, overloaded in excess of every limit by all manner of ballast, still somehow, to the astonishment of all, keeps afloat. And at this point the senior officers, not wishing to go to the bottom with passengers and crew, urgently launched a "modernized" craft for themselves, boarded it, and began hastily to move away from the sinking ship.

However, I ask you to forgive the metaphor; it may be a true one, but it fails to reflect the full political acuteness, drama, and confusion of the prevailing situation. But it is not the poverty of my creative imagination which is at fault. It is simply that situations can arise in real life which prove impenetrable to even the most fertile imagination...

It is impossible even, you will agree, to imagine that officers fleeing a sinking ship should try at the same time... to remain on board it. But that is precisely what these eminent "founders" of the new political party are attempting to do. Having essentially announced a fight to the death with the "conservative" CPSU, they, despite this, remain members of its leadership and are not averse even to maintaining the reputation of its "progressive vanguard"!

But the explanation of this latest spectacle in the political theater of the absurd is basically simple. The "bold innovators" are not absolutely sure that the ship will be irrevocably dragged down into the depths—and suppose it does manage to avoid foundering and steams on ahead again... On the other hand, you cannot linger: The new election campaigns, including that for the post of president of the Union of "Sovereign" States, are already in the air. It is now time, in their view, to firmly dissociate themselves from a bankrupt policy and a leader who has lost the trust of the people; delay, and more adroit rivals will promptly outflank them. A banal fight to secure a place in the sun, to hold onto the usual material, psychological, and other benefits and privileges, and to have the opportunity to receive endless invitations for lecture tours at prestigious foreign universities carrying fees of many thousands of dollars is taking place under cover of sickly, cloying talk about "democracy," "humanism," and "panhuman values." All this is nauseatingly wearisome and as old as the hills! But what constantly amazes is how our priceless suggestibility and credulity are seemingly incapable of being shaken by even the most blatant treachery and hypocrisy.

"What's wrong in a group of prominent democratic figures advocating constructive cooperation and spiritual, political, and economic freedom?"—ask people who would seem to be wise in years of experience of life and politics. "The announced program," others say, echoing them, "is nonconfrontational in nature and you should therefore seek agreement and dialogue with the reformists rather than casting them aside." Let us remember, however, that initially the program and slogans of the people's fronts in a number of republics did not make us apprehensive either, rather they inspired sympathy. What the tactics of "constructive dialogue" with them led to needs no spelling out now...

"Once embarked on a path of expelling the best intellectual minds and of enmity and rivalry, we will only achieve a mass exodus from the party of those sympathetic to them." Good riddance, if you will excuse my language! And then you can hardly put among the "best minds" Academician Yakovlev, who got all his party and academic titles and posts by showering praise on developed socialism and wrathfully denouncing the vices of capitalism and who, now, having suddenly seen the light, dishes out abuse and plaudits in completely the opposite direction. E.A. Shevardnadze, whose turgid speeches have to date been reminiscent of the toasts of yore and which are aimed at an intoxicated audience... hardly figures among the "best." The country and the party will need many years, if not decades, to undo the results of the "intellectual activity" of these "best minds"...

"The party, which is already going through a critical time, does not need a split now"—"sensible," "pragmatic" people seek to persuade us from our television screens and the pages of certain publications. But, in my opinion, the party will only grow stronger if it cleanses its ranks.

The disintegration of the former ruling parties in East Europe is cited, which, allegedly, was the "result of a split." But the problem was not a "split," but the fact that the people at the helm of those parties openly set the task of replacing the "obsolete" communist movement with a "modern," "civilized" one.

"Who, then, will get a place on the new 'Noah's Ark'?—thus NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, which is close in spirit to the "reformists" and the founders of the new party, very accurately describes the mood reigning in their camp. Let them think about their own places, it is high time we Communists gave serious thought to how to save the party and the country.

Founding of Democratic Reform Movement Viewed
LD0507140191 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT
5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—Two days ago former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who is now president of the Foreign Policy Association, sent the

Central Control Commission a written application for withdrawal from the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU).

"I have arrived at a difficult, the hardest decision," he said in an interview published in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today. "My entire life has been connected with the party. Hence the magnitude of disappointments that have compelled me to take this step. I could not act otherwise.

"I do not intend to make political capital through my resignation from the CPSU. I believe, however, that the Democratic Reform Movement, of which I was a founder, is a constructive movement, for it sets as its ultimate goal to unite people who cherish the ideals of democracy," Shevardnadze said.

"I read very attentively the founders of the new movement's address entitled 'For the Unity of the Forces of Democracy and Reforms'," Gennadiy Seleznev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, writes in today's PRAVDA.

"I can admit: I am prepared to approve much of what is contained in the text. What is unacceptable to me is the categorical and non-alternative nature of the conclusions, such as these: 'Either the country proceeds along the road of radical reforms, or there will be a revolt of reactionaries, a new dictatorship, restoration of the old ways, angst and violence. Poverty would triumph again, and a countrywide tragedy would be inevitable'.

"If it were that simple, there would have been no need to create any movements," Seleznev observes. "Many of us would like to believe in the sincerity of the document, and the sincerity of the principles declared by the founders of the movement. Everything in this respect is sensible, reasonable and in keeping with parliamentary policy being pursued by the country's Supreme Soviet.

"But there are still doubts about the sincerity of 'the nine', their ability to translate these principles into reality and their commitment to them.

"We are not so naive any longer and have gained experience as regards the establishment and subsequent evolution of popular fronts, the Sajudis, Birlik and other movements which, when emerging, styled themselves as pro-perestroika organisations. However, they soon forgot all about perestroika. Could this happen to the newly established movement? I do not know. Time will tell," Seleznev writes.

"If passions and emotions stirred by the address issued by the nine are put aside, then there remains the usual question: Why such a stir? Aren't there quite a few other movements emerging in this country?" Anatoliy Karpychev writes in an article in PRAVDA.

"It seems to me that if there were no signatures of people officially close to Gorbachev under the 'statement by people from V to Y', as it has already been dubbed, it would have hardly aroused such a stir.

"The movement is not of a confrontational character", Karpychev quotes the Soviet presidential assistant as saying. "It invites all those who genuinely champion the ideals of perestroika and root for the success of our common cause in the country'.

"If the founding of the movement is understood in this way, then this is a positive factor", Karpychev notes.

Shevardnadze Cited on Reform Movement

LD0707041891 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Excerpts] Eduard Shevardnadze, president of the Soviet Foreign Policy Association, was in Leningrad today. More details from our correspondent Denis Gurinskiy on the phone.

[Gurinskiy] Eduard Shevardnadze arrived in Leningrad today on a one-day unofficial working visit. Having met the founders of the Leningrad Foreign Policy Association, Shevardnadze then went to Mariinskiy Palace to see the city's mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak, and they had a 90-minute conversation behind closed doors. However, your correspondent managed to obtain information on the talks from one of the leaders of Leningrad city soviet who was present at the meeting. First, a common stand was reached at the meeting by Shevardnadze and Sobchak on the crucial organizational and political aspects of the new Movement for Democratic Reforms. Proceeding from this, both founders of the movement found it necessary to open the nascent movement's first organizational committee nowhere else but in Leningrad. It was stressed that it is urgently necessary to involve Leningrad's colossal intellectual and scholarly potential in the promotion of the process of the establishment of the reform movement. [passage omitted]

Commenting further on the position of the CPSU Central Committee concerning his call for setting up a new political movement, Shevardnadze declared that people in the Central Control Commission of the CPSU Central Committee should not investigate his personal case, but rather start an objective investigation of the activities of those high-ranking CPSU members who were directly involved in the tragic events in Tbilisi, Baku, Vilnius, and elsewhere in the country.

Shevardnadze confirmed once again his determination in the coming weeks to officially leave the ranks of the CPSU, adding that he did not deny his own responsibility for the actions of the party and the state during his work as a minister and on previous posts.

Answering a question from your correspondent after the meeting on how he views the desirable character of the new movement's activities, Shevardnadze spoke in favor of imparting an honest, constructive, and rational character to the movement's work. It must form an opposition to the central power structures.

Denis Gurinskiy for Radio Rossii, Sankt-Peterburg.

Cross-Spectrum Reconciliation Urged

PM0507143091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 pp 8-9

[Article by Oleg Vite: "Levels of Reconciliation. With 9 + 1 at the Top, What Lies Below?"]

[Text] Only reconciliation of the major political forces can give credibility to the team that will undertake to implement the anticrisis programme, with its unpopular measures. So far there is no reconciliation, no team. The problem of the day is to move on from the question "What is to be done?" to "Who is to do it?"

The Darker The Enemy, The Better For Us

The propaganda efforts of every political party in this country rely mostly on blood-curdling pictures of the dangerous social tendencies towards which the given party's political rivals are pushing society. If the picture of a desirable future can be regarded as a party's programme, the nightmarish picture of the unacceptable future can be called its antiprogramme.

You can best tell a party's stripes by its antiprogramme.

Two antiprogrammes are especially popular in this country now. The democrats keep terrifying the population with the dictatorship of a communist partocracy. The conservatives paint a picture of total capitalism and a sell-out of Motherland to the West.

In fact, these antiprogrammes are all we have to go by when anti- is the only meaning attached to the concepts it comes to sizing up the democrats and conservatives.

The democratic antiprogramme does away with the CPSU's monopoly on state power. But it is utterly impossible to lead a society out of the crisis on the basis of an antiprogramme.

The Democratic Russia movement is a graphic example. Irreconcilable differences on secondary issues have been paralyzing all constructive activity, in spite of their antiprogramme unity. Nothing but support for Yeltsin's positive programme (and Silayev's government) may help the Democratic Russia overcome its own crisis.

Representatives of both the democrats and conservatives have been eagerly looking for a class to associate themselves and their rivals with. Both camps tend to regard the working masses (often called the people) as their social base, while calling the opposition the exploiters.

The democrats are sure that their opponents represent the interests of the nomenklatura. The conservatives say that the democrats work for the blackmarketeers. As a result, the ideas of both camps about each other seem to be borrowed from the propaganda leaflets of 1917.

The enemy image in the opposing camps is created on the basis of the opponents' presumed guilt. All current

events which appear undesirable to our party are immediately ascribed to their secret plotting. So totally prejudiced are the two sides against each other that one can hardly expect them to sit down at the Round Table together, let alone come to agreement...

But this is not the only problems.

Are There Enough Chairs At The Table?

The Round Table makes sense only if there is room at it for all political forces.

Political forces here exist in five different forms. The best-known form is a political party. Also there are political associations of major social groups, such as trade unions and the workers' movement (for the working masses), the associations of enterprises and the Scientific-Industrial Union (for the nomenklatura), the associations of cooperative societies, farmers, etc. (for entrepreneurs).

Add to these the factions existing in Soviets of all levels, which do not necessarily correspond to parties. Parliamentary factions are the most conspicuous form today. The Leningrad City Soviet led by Sobchak and Russia's Supreme Soviet led by Yeltsin are independent political forces.

But the most significant of them all is what I would call the old power. Its main distinction is not so much the ideas or decisions it propounds, but the secret nature of its decision making. The old power acts behind the scenes, its decisions are classified by definition. Therefore, it can only influence the representatives at the Round Table indirectly, through the political structures involved.

CPSU'S Many Faces

To a certain extent, all political struggle in our society is inner-party struggle within the CPSU framework. All candidates for Russia's presidency and vice-presidency have their roots in the CPSU or are graphic examples of its disintegration.

In a way, the CPSU is now living through a painful period of repartization, that is to say, its conversion from a state structure back into a political party.

There are diametrically opposed ideological platforms within the party. Also it has been splitting into segments which play different roles in various structures.

For instance, the Central Committees of the CPSU and the Russian Federation CP differ not only ideologically, but also in that the former is closely connected with the old power in Moscow, whereas the latter is not very welcome in the Centre, and relies more heavily on its close ties with regional party committees.

The United Front of Working People, the Russian Federation CP's Founding Congress, and the Russian Federation CP were steps towards the most conservative variant of the CPSU's repartization.

The antiprogramme nature of the final product manifested itself when the Russian Federation CP came out of trenches with nothing better than desperate war cries and the propaganda strategy borrowed wholesale from the democrats' antiprogramme for the 1989 election.

The Democratic Communists' Movement (as a legitimate heir to the Democratic Platform) and the Communists for Democracy faction organized by Colonel Rutskoy lie within the same reformist tendency. However, the former is an association of solitary intellectuals, while the latter unites people's deputies with some experience in parliamentary work.

Various groups of managerial nomenklatura such as the Scientific Industrial Union and the Association of Industrial Enterprises, etc. are almost 100 percent communist. They do not want to see the CPSU's repartization. But their orientation towards a "moderate market", and their close links with the old power considerably increase the chances of a reformist evolution for the CPSU.

Also there are grassroots CPSU organizations to be reckoned with - disoriented, demanding clear instructions from above, running down party bosses for their inability to define their positions. Influential party organizations exist in the Union Republics' state structures, primarily in the army, the KGB, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In them, the spontaneous process of departization is accompanied by spontaneous struggle among different factions.

All those forces, plus many more, make up the CPSU today. How can such a fragmented organization be represented at the Round Table by a single delegation?

Two Models

Least of all can we hope to construct the Round Table on the basis of abstract models. It would be best to turn to practical experience to look for workable ideas.

Dazzled by the East European model we might end up down a blind alley. The desire to see, as the result of our Round Table, a voluntary if now honorary capitulation of communists is a naive attempt to outwit history. The East European model will not do for us. The 1989-90 elections have already undermined the communist monopoly and revealed the possible balance of forces. So far one can hardly expect it to change.

The Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies reflects this balance quite accurately. It is only natural therefore that the Congress has come up with another model for a Round Table. The model is called the Conciliation Commission. In conciliation commissions representatives of the two opposing antiprogrammes

look for and find ways to develop joint (and therefore positive) solutions without disturbing the existing balance of forces.

It is conceivable that this model is optimal for the Union Republics. As for an All-Union Round Table, where various parties and movements would set up a coalition government, this does not have a chance.

A Multi-Storyed Round Table

At the central All-Union Round Table, the contradictory results of various Republics' Round Tables can be reconciled. The imperial nature of the USSR is likely to create additional difficulties.

But every dark cloud has a silver lining. However ruinous the move to independence by the Republics might be for the former empire, it has given rise to an effective mechanism for the solution of existing problems. Sovereignization of state power in the Union Republics has legitimized one and only form of political representation at the All-Union Round table (instead of five forms existing in this country). The Union Republics will be represented by their heads of state. This makes the idea of reconciliation feasible at long last. Hence the 9+1 agreement reached in Novo-Ogarevo. The process now developing in Novo-Ogarevo is the Round Table as a real fact, not as wishful thinking.

The 9+1 agreement has put a full stop to a whole period of Soviet history since April 1985. The character of central power has fundamentally changed in the past six years. It has changed hands, passing from the CPSU Central Committee to the Round Table at which the leaders of sovereign Republics confer with the USSR President. This new Centre has taken not only political and administrative shape, but also defined itself ideologically. From now on centrism is the system of ideas and views conforming to the spirit of Novo-Ogarevo. But the process can explode from within if the leaders of the Republics fail to faithfully represent the public sentiment back home.

Therefore a Round Table for the various parties and movements ought to be put on the level of the individual Republics. If even that level does not prove strongly enough, the whole building will surely collapse.

Travkin Urges Unification of Democratic Forces

PM0507105591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 p 1

[Unattributed report under "Party Chronicle" rubric: "Country Has Grown Tired of Waiting"]

[Text] The association of democratic forces is beginning in the classical manner—with a demarcation. The discontent of the "practitioners" in the form of N. Travkin and his colleagues from the Social Democratic Party of Russia and the Republican Party of Russia with the

"theoreticians" who signed the much-publicized appeal has produced yet another appeal—"On the creation of a United Democratic Party of the country." The document opens with a no-nonsense phrase: "The country has grown tired of waiting..." Which is quite fair. What we are all waiting for is clear—political stability, civil accord, and democratic reforms.

A conference of leaders of the Democratic Party of Russia, the Republican Party of Russia, and the Social Democratic Party of Russia has set the date for the first sitting of the organizational committee—15 July. A unification congress will be held in September. The party is intended to be all-Union—it already has structures and a membership base. The democratic parties of Tajikistan and Turkmenia have sided with N. Travkin, by the way.

"We all feel," the appeal says, "that the transformation of the CPSU is being prepared, and we must create a party quickly before they package us in some new movement which is democratic but is of no avail to the system."

In addition to Travkin the signatories of the statement include Academician S. Shatalin; People's Deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] V. Aksyuchits, chairman of the Russian Christian Movement Political Council; M. Astafyev, chairman of the People's Freedom Party (Cadets) Central Committee, and others.

Kasparov Organizing Liberal-Conservative Union

LD0307093291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2021 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow, 2 July. (TASS)—IZVESTIYA reports today that a constituent conference of the Liberal-Conservative Union is planned for the end of September this year.

The initiative to set up this union comes from Gary Kasparov and Arkadiy Murashev who in April this year left the Democratic Party of Russia, having accused its chairman, Nikolay Travkin, of being non-democratic in internal party affairs and of departing from the basic principles of a democratic party, including rigid anti-communism. At the same time, they expressed their intention to set up an organization of a traditional conservative orientation in the spirit of Thatcherism.

Kasparov and Murashev have like-minded people in about 80 towns throughout Russia, both within the Democratic Party and outside it, reports Larisa Zinchenko a union organizer. The organizational committee of the Liberal-Conservative Union is being formed. Work on draft rules and the program must be concluded by August. The name of the new party will be determined at the constituent conference.

Constitution Commission Favors Union Treaty

LD0707092191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Committee for Compliance with the Constitution, after examining the draft union treaty, has expressed itself in favor of seeing it signed. At a briefing which took place immediately after the committee's final session, Sergey Alekseyev, its chairman, stated:

[Begin Alekseyev recording] The Union treaty, the draft Union treaty and the prospects for it being concluded—this offers a direct way out of the difficult situation in which our country finds itself. In particular, we are alarmed by the fact that some groups are attempting to torpedo this process of concluding the union treaty; and what is particularly regrettable for us, for what we stand for, is that in a number of cases this is done with reference to the constitution as if this process, and the working out of the union treaty along with its impending signing is something that runs contrary to the constitutional process.

We do not see any violation of the constitution either in the process of preparing this document, or in its content. Unfortunately, the draft union treaty does not fix the ownership of general union property, but puts forward the construction of the joint property of republics; moreover, from the legal point of view, this construction is not completely correct, and how it applies to the union still needs to be worked out.

In a number of cases, our views have a fairly specific character, but their character bears the wish that future work on the union treaty will be carried out in such a way that it does not break that very fine and very fragile accord and compromise reached at Novo-Ogarevo. [end recording]

Prospect for Western Aid Discussed

PM0507143691 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 p 13

[Unattributed interview with Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade Committee Chairman Vladimir Lukin; date, place not given: "The West Will Indeed Help the USSR..."]

[Text] ... but only on the condition that the USSR itself does something to reciprocate the efforts, think Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev and Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade Committee Chairman Vladimir Lukin.

[MOSCOW NEWS] Excited expectation now dominates the life of this country. We're awaiting the outcome of the elections, and anticipating adoption of new laws as something which will enable us to turn a new page. Quite

recently we were waiting to see whether President Gorbachev would be invited to the London meeting of the Big Seven and he offered a coveted loan of billions believed to be capable of breaking the country's current crisis.

Vladimir Lukin: Indeed, intermittent apathy and agitation is typical of a society which is not particularly sound. I'm all for the 9+1 agreement, but objectively I conclude that an agitation around the agreement is as bad as the preceding apathy, because the former fraught with bitter disappointment. Fluctuations in the public's attitudes are very sharp indeed now.

A friend of mine asked me: "Will Gorbachev go to London or not?" "But why is it so important for you?" I retorted. In fact, the actual meaning of his question was: Will the situation in the country change for the better as a result of Gorbachev's visit to London?

[MOSCOW NEWS] Will it indeed, what do you think? The subject of Gorbachev's participation in the meeting receives intensive discussion because massive financial aid is potentially involved. V.L.: The West will help us out—this was a motto of Ostap Bender, a very popular character created by Ilf and Petrov in their satirical novels, and also is an extensively used slogan nowadays. There's also a certain grotesque in the position of the people peddling this idea. My suggestion would be to make no more programmes but take a more serious approach to the given reality. Instead of multiplying ideas about our further development, we must link the aid programmes with the concrete work of people who are already doing something in this direction.

The Partnership of Progress programme which was described in a recent MN issue seems to have the same fault. MN justly wrote that Nikolay Shmelev came up with precisely the same suggestions two years ago. In this country, business entrepreneurship has been enjoying a bad reputation, whether justly or otherwise. We've got to stop our wishful thinking and embark on actual cooperation with the business world. Andrey Kozyrev: I agree that sound skepticism is a good thing. It's time we embark on cooperation with the shapers of the world's economy, primarily, with the Big Seven. But we mustn't close our eyes to the serious obstacles barring our way towards integration into the world's economic system.

The first obstacle is ideology of the so-called "option for socialism". This ideology establishes priority of the collective property over all other kinds of property-owning, and it is against market and free business entrepreneurship as such. The second impediment is the CPSU and, to an even greater degree, the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. The Communist Parties openly act as a drag on the progress of the reform. It was easy to see in connection with the privatization attempts in the countryside. Market-oriented reforms headed by communists are a delusion. The third obstacle is posed by the existence of the military-industrial complex which hasn't begun and is not likely to ever begin to

change over to operations according to the rules of the market, though this switch will be necessary to ensure the country's defence as early as the turn of this century. Last but not least, we also deal with an impediment posed by the existence of the system of centralized control over the economy by the ministries and the state Planning Committee (no matter what other name it may be called). All the large-scale money injections are bound to go down the drain until we reach an understanding on main political issues. But a purpose-oriented aid to, for example, Russia's farmers will be a good thing.

[MOSCOW NEWS] You mention a programme (initiated by MN and Hill and Knowlton of the US) of cooperation between small and medium-scale private business in joint projects the worth of which was proved by a board of experts. Is this programme in line with your ideas about cooperation with the West?

V.L.: This initiative perfectly meshes with my concept of business cooperation. However, MN's presentation of the project had some words which reminded me about certain friends of mine who love speechifying in terms of perestroika. Writing about the Partnership for Progress project, you call upon economists, public figures, and the press to embark upon a broad discussion of the matter. But we've had discussions for six years now, and everything which could be said about it has been said. We simply don't have time for more discussions.

A.K.: Discussions are necessary unless they are of a purely scholastic nature. After all, such discussions are still on in the countries which have been self-supporting for a long time now, and no need to ask outside aid to help their economies. In my opinion, the MN initiative is undoubtedly good. However, it cannot be treated as a remedy for every illness.

[MOSCOW NEWS] Your recently met with some Western world's decision makers. What is their opinion about financial aid to the Soviet Union now when the meeting of the Big Seven is nearing?

A.K.: I recently visited the U.S. and met the US Secretary of State, James Baker, as well as congressional leaders of the two parties. Then I visited Japan and had a conversation with Premier Kaifu and a large number of business people. We spoke about aid for the USSR and the prospects for inviting Mikhail Gorbachev to the meeting of the Big Seven.

It is obvious that the politicians of the countries of the Big Seven sincerely wish us to integrate into the world's economy and to proceed from words to deeds in this direction. But they all ask the same questions which Japan and Western Europe already answered in the past, when the US asked them: Do you have a government committed to radical privatization and acceptance of direct foreign investments? Or is your government afraid of both? Did the government win the elections?

This is more than a question about the legitimacy of the authorities at power. In fact, they wanted to be sure that

the plans—however enthusiastically they might be accepted by the government—would be accepted by the people as well. The USSR will also have to answer these questions. Quests being done by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy are beneficial, because they prove that the West will be able to help us only after we ourselves agree to reform our economic system.

[MOSCOW NEWS] President Gorbachev until recently was representing the whole Soviet nation in talks with Western leaders. Thinking about the developing process of increasing sovereignty of Soviet Republics, what will the USSR President represent at the London meeting, speaking in terms of actual reality?

V.L.: I would formulate this question differently. Talking to people in the West, I always tried to make them see that in dealing with this country, it is only sensible to support innovative structures which are full of promise and new life, in contrast to the moribund traditional USSR central structures. The fault of the latter is that life is ebbing out of them, and not that they are central structures. It's not really important where the project or enterprise in question is registered: with the Centre or one of the Republics. The important thing is the absence of contradiction in various laws and of controversy between different authorities.

A.K.: The West is not going to give us lucrative loans until there is reliable coordination of actions between the central and republican authorities in the matter of introduction of market economy. I hear the reproach that I'm unpatriotic, since I don't want my country helped out. As a reply to this reproach, let me remind you about another literary character who comes to Prince Myshkin (a character in Dostoyevsky's novel "The Idiot"—Ed.) and begs the latter to never lend him money, should he approach Prince Myshkin with such a request. In fact, lending money to the USSR's traditional structures is like lending it to a drunkard who is bound to make no good use of it and ruin his own home to boot. I wonder if there's a connection between Western loans which the USSR received last summer and the USSR's shift to the right which has come about in the subsequent fall and winter. This is something to be thought over both by the West and Soviets who indirectly blackmail the West with a possibility of the USSR's disintegration fraught with nuclear disasters hitting the whole world if the West refuses to support the USSR with hundreds of billions in loans. I pity Russia and the USSR.

But the West will help us out if we agree to try to help ourselves.

Government Action To Aid Press Survival Urged

PM0507104591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Problems of Press Survival"]

[Text] Only the state can protect subscribers and ensure their legitimate right to information. Such was the conclusion drawn by participants in the session of the USSR Journalists' Union Council held in the capital 26-28 June.

In the opinion of forum participants the problems of the press's survival in the crisis conditions should be resolved without delay by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the union republic governments.

The unregulated nature of a range of legal questions concerning press activity and the absence of a smooth-running system of state support remain to this day a serious obstacle to the discharge of its noble mission by the press.

As a result many well-known publications, let alone the small-circulation press, are now on the verge of bankruptcy. Many journalists are still subject to persecution and are not in a position to defend their rights.

The Journalists' Union sees the solution to the approaching crisis as lying in the adoption of appropriate laws by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the creation of state funds to support noncommercial publications and of sources of finance for them. It is also essential to create equal conditions of management for all publications, irrespective of their orientation or affiliation, by privatizing the publishing and printing base. The group of USSR people's deputies elected by the USSR Journalists' Union should argue the case for these and other demands of the press to the state organs of power. And this group will be headed by Z. Sagalaye, chairman of the USSR Journalists' Union, elected a people's deputy of the Soviet parliament at the session.

Editor on IZVESTIYA Office 'Conflicts'

PM0307143091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 p 3

[Article by IZVESTIYA editor Yuriy Makarov: "Say No to Death"]

[Text] In my twenty years as a journalist, for the first time today I feel like addressing my colleagues rather than my readers.

Because I feel my newspaper is dying.

I joined the IZVESTIYA staff comparatively late, but a whole epoch ago: in April 1985. It was springtime for journalism, the first waves of glasnost, the first timid attempts at free speech...

I can't say that my Editor-in-Chief Ivan Laptev left IZVESTIYA for the Supreme Soviet last year with an easy heart. There was one thing, though, which both he and the IZVESTIYA journalists agreed about on his departure: our newspaper's policy had been clearly defined and accepted by the readers. Also, there were reliable people to put that policy into effect. IZVESTIYA

journalists unanimously elected Igor Golembiovskiy, the then Deputy Editor-in-Chief and IZVESTIYA's own man, to be their leader.

Immediately, the news came of the staff being "reinforced" by the CPSU Central Committee Member, Nikolay Yefimov, once a Deputy Editor-in-Chief of IZVESTIYA, having been put in time at the CPSU Central Committee ideological department and eventually promoted to the ministerial rank of Chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press.

Work stopped. Conflicts began. Yefimov faced a collective who had a taste of freedom, had risen from their knees, and were unwilling to kneel down again.

It is a most ungrateful task to rule on behalf of a party which is not longer ruling, constitutionally. I might have pitied Nikolay Yefimov, if I did not feel so sorry for my newspaper!

IZVESTIYA began dying. Potentially the strongest team of journalists in Moscow has been wasting their energy on the struggle against the Editor-in-Chief's unprofessionalism, insincerity and tendentiousness, instead of making a good newspaper. Much has been written about the February revolt at IZVESTIYA, when Yefimov tried to send Golembiovsky, on a long-term mission abroad. We defended him, but lost IZVESTIYA. The circulation has been falling. The leading journalists are thinking of going, and some have already left: Irina Dementyeva, Pavel Gutionov... Who will be next?

I am afraid we are in for more losses: the latest developments at IZVESTIYA began with rumours which alleged that Vladimir Sevruck would be the next Editor-in-Chief of our Sunday supplement Nedelya. Vladimir Sevruck had once been banished to Izvestia (as first Deputy Editor-In-Chief) from the ideological department of the CPSU Central Committee.

On June 5, Nedelya was in a state of shock. The staff turned to Nikolay Yefimov for clarification. "These are rumours," the Editor-in-chief answered with authority.

On June 6, the same question was again addressed to him during the morning editorial meeting. "I haven't yet attended to the rumours," Yefimov said. Nevertheless, full of apprehension, the editorial board sent a dispatch to Anatoliy Lukyanov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "Are these rumours or what? Why is the opinion of the editorial board being ignored?"

On June 7 the reply arrived when Nikolay Yefimov, without blushing, introduced Vladimir Sevruck as the newly appointed Editor-in-Chief of Nedelya and Dmitriy Mamleyev as the new First Deputy Editor-in-Chief of IZVESTIYA.

The rumours have been dispelled!

When we are being told that the offensive against glasnost is the figment of our journalistic fancy, we protest. But the offensive against glasnost is no abstraction. It is

quite concrete: first Kravchenko on television, now Sevruck at Nedelya. For a decade he had been responsible for scuttling glasnost at Central Committee HQ, and has become a symbol of the ideology so utterly condemned today. This is just Moscow. My colleagues in the provinces could come up with more, I am sure. The offensive is in full swing.

While informing us of the nomination which had dispelled the so-called rumours, Nikolay Yefimov used the President's approval as his trump card. Those people from Central Committee HQ (both those actually working for the CC today and those cherishing it in their hearts) are very fond of this trump card. Having closed in on the President they keep doing their favourite job, while we often ask ourselves: why doesn't he try to resist them? Doubts and disappointments multiply...

In the given case the President has twice violated the Press Law: Dmitriy Mamleyev (however positive IZVESTIYA journalists' attitude to him might be) could only be appointed First Deputy Editor-in-Chief by IZVESTIYA's founder, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, whose members were informed of the appointment postfactum, like ourselves.

Once again the ideologists who used to interpret snowflakes in our stories as the star of David are on the offensive. Their resources are total cynicism, proficiency in apparat games, and disdain of public opinion.

What are our own resources? The experience of the last six years, and most importantly, millions of our readers who chose IZVESTIYA and Nedelya because of our striving for glasnost and democracy—not for the old opinions emanating from old squares.

We journalists have repeatedly written about the availability of legal collective responses to illegal apparat attacks. We wrote that for the others. Today we must find such responses for ourselves.

TASS Reviews 6 July Press

LD0607065191 Moscow TASS in English 0642 GMT
6 Jul 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Most newspapers today lead with reports about the working meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Kiev on Friday.

PRAVDA and many other newspapers cover talks between the leaders of the two countries and the joint news conference they held after a day of talks.

PRAVDA, in particular, notes that as a result of the encounter of the two leaders, there is every reason to believe that the meeting marked another favorable landmark on the favorable road. PRAVDA carries the full text of the joint news conference held by the two leaders.

The press reports that the Soviet president and the German chancellor left Kiev on the same day.

PRAVDA reports on the end of Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari's official visit to the Soviet Union on Friday. The newspaper carries the text of the Soviet-Mexican declaration adopted as a result of the visit.

PRAVDA publishes the text of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's telegram to chairman of the Yugoslavia Presidium Stjepan Mesic congratulating him on the election to the post.

PRAVDA carries the texts of the telegrams exchanged by President Mikhail Gorbachev and North Korean Leader Kim Il Sung on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between North Korea and the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA notes in an article headlined "20 days to go before the plenum" that Communists will take advantage of the remaining three weeks to think deeply about, and analyze experience and contradictions in the development of the party and the country.

The KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) newspaper carried a profile of Finland's Defence Minister Elizabeth Rehn, who is arriving on an official visit to the Soviet Union on July 8.

PRAVDA carries new versions of prominent Russian poet Sergei Yesenin's death.

PRAVDA'S political analyst Tomas Kolesnichenko discusses aspects of the forthcoming London G7 summit and stresses that the Soviet president's dialogue with the leaders of the world's leading industrialized countries is due to cover more issues than purely economic problems.

TASS Reviews 8 July PRAVDA

LD0807070391 Moscow TASS in English 0543 GMT 8 Jul 91

["Soviet PRAVDA Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—Today's PRAVDA carries interviews with President A. Mutalibov of Azerbaijan and President S. Niyazov of Turkmenia, who comment on the new union treaty.

The treaty enables republics to realise their national interests and expand cooperation, Mutalibov said.

The treaty envisages genuine sovereignty for republics, Niyazov said.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev met Kastriot Islami, president of Albania's People's Assembly, PRAVDA reports. Islami leads a parliamentary delegation, visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet parliament.

Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez arrived in Moscow at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, PRAVDA reports.

PRAVDA comments on relations between the city and the countryside. Low prices for agricultural products and high prices for agricultural machinery ruin farmers, the newspaper writes.

The newspaper writes about a debate on privileges in the Soviet parliament. A parliamentary commission discovered that Defence Ministry officials and cabinet members bought state dachas and property at rock-bottom prices, it says.

The newspaper comments on the after-effects of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster.

Heavy floods in Moldavia resulted in human deaths and wide-spread material damage, it reports.

PRAVDA carries comments by Analyst Nikolai Shishlin about the disbandment of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the Warsaw Treaty. The two organisations, resulting from regional isolationism, run-away confrontation and doctrinaire thinking have ceased to exist, PRAVDA writes.

"The liquidation of our joint military-political and economic organisations is a useful and justified step towards new well-balanced links in Eastern Europe," it writes.

Enamul Haque, director of the Bangladesh Institute of the Press, comments in PRAVDA on Soviet-Bangladesh relations.

Political changes in Bangladesh following the election of a democratic government set the stage for developing relations between the two countries, he said.

Bangladesh Foreign Minister Mustafizur Rahman's forthcoming visit to Moscow offers an excellent chance to expand these relations, the newspaper writes.

In an editorial comment, PRAVDA praises Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari's visit to the Soviet Union as fruitful and useful.

Bilateral documents signed during the visit highlight the two countries' desire to expand bilateral cooperation and trust, PRAVDA stresses.

The newspaper reports clashes on the border between Serbia and Croatia in Yugoslavia.

Economic

Pavlov Sees Requisites for Economic Improvement

LD0307192191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Text] Joint actions by republics to build a market economy within a single economic dimension (of) the USSR must be the key to implementing an anti-crisis

program. Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov voiced such a view at a news conference on Wednesday, according to a report by (our) correspondent. He also underscored the social trend of the market economy and stressed the need to drastically restructure the economy to gear it to the needs of the people.

In Pavlov's opinion, there is no alternative to the cabinet's anti-crisis plan which within a year presupposes restoring the production level in the fields vital for the population and in the basic industries, curbing inflation, stabilizing money circulation and normalizing the supply of essentials to the population.

Are there any signs of recovery in the sphere of production? Valentin Pavlov believes that such signs do exist. He said: As of April the production level stabilized compared with last year. It's lower than last year's level by 6 percent or so but it has not been going down. This situation is unstable. If efforts to consolidate the position fail, there is every chance of further decline, but there are prerequisites for going up little by little.

Valentin Pavlov referred to such prerequisites as the started restoration of production of such major consumer goods as television sets, refrigerators, textiles, and footwear. Compared with last year their production level in March and April ranged between 82 and 92 percent, and in June between 96 and 98 percent. Pavlov believes that the peak in the price reform is over as well. The government does not plan an administrative price hike in its program. Those who predict a price hike of up to 10 to 15 times have no sense of humor at all, remarked Prime Minister Pavlov.

The cabinet would resort to amortization measures, non-market by (the) nature right away. The Soviet Union must move towards a market economy no matter whether the West helps it to do so or not, declared Valentin Pavlov. Of course if Western countries decide to expand aid to the USSR, this will help it implement the program of transition to a market, the premier pointed out. Speaking about the agreement [words indistinct] program worked out with Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's assistance, Valentin Pavlov remarked that if it were regarded as a program of assistance to the USSR, he would be ready to take part in planning any measures to use the funds that the West would make available to the USSR.

Yavlinskiy, Primakov on Economic Reform Program
PM0507132091 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No. 24, 16-23 Jun 91 p 1

[Vladimir Gurevich report: "Hello, Boston? Yes, Answered Grigoriy Yavlinskiy"]

[Text] [Gurevich] You've been working at Harvard for three weeks already...

[Yavlinskiy]...And we feel like we've done enough work for several months. However, we already see light at the end of the tunnel. One of these days we're going to see the document out of the pipeline, and then we'll be off for home.

[Gurevich] Are you speaking about the document to be submitted to the Big Seven summit on London?

[Yavlinskiy] I'm not sure about that. However, I believe the document will be shown to George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev. Of course it will be shown to everyone who commissioned us to do this present job, including Yeltsin and Nazarbayev.

[Gurevich] Describe how you and your team get along with your American colleagues who are collaborating with you in working out the document?

[Yavlinskiy] We get along fine and cooperate in a perfect businesslike manner. Frankly, we're mighty tired now, partly because of the language barrier. Nevertheless, we understand each other well. In addition, our American partners were delighted at presentation of our work during my meetings with Bush and Baker.

[Gurevich] What is the US public's reaction to your work?

[Yavlinskiy] It has had a good press, extensive and very sensible. About ten per cent of the authors are attacking the project, but the rest are largely sympathetic. The people involved in the work themselves are too busy for interviews however.

[Gurevich] Having this interview makes us feel privileged. Than you very much. [Gurevich ends]

When Yavlinskiy and his colleagues were concluding their mission in the US, a kind of controversy sprouted up around that mission.

In this connection, a member of the National Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov, gave the following explanation: "Yavlinskiy is working to make the Soviet transition to a market economy mesh with the work of the Big Seven. If Yavlinskiy and his team succeed, it will open up the way for further development of our plans and expansion of the government programme. The importance of Yavlinskiy's mission is this. Citing Yavlinskiy's own words, Primakov said that Yavlinskiy is working on instructions and commission from the USSR President himself."

Upon his return from the US, with Yevgeniy Primakov, Soviet Vice-Premier Vladimir Shcherbakov said: "Yavlinskiy is not working on an alternative programme, though he and some of his colleagues and American partners have this ambition. We explained to Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and George Bush that the development of an alternative programme would be pointless and interesting only as scholastic research."

Did President Bush understand the explanation? In which capacity did Grigoriy Yavlinskiy participate in the meeting with the US President? Judging from a report in *Financial Times* (its June 3 issue), Yavlinskiy's "ambitious plans" were taken as rather sensible. At any rate, says *Financial Times*, during the meeting with the US President Yavlinskiy described his plan for 20 minutes and afterwards was asked to expand on it.

Whether the US President took a practical rather than an academic interest in the matter will be clear after he (and also the USSR President and leaders of Russia and Kazakhstan) receives the documents forged at Harvard.

In the meantime, Great Britain, the host of the coming meeting of the Big Seven, extended an official request to the leaders of the other six participant countries to invite Mikhail Gorbachev to the London meeting.

Ministry Releases Preliminary Budget Data

OW0807051491 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1930 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR Finance Ministry has published preliminary data on the results of the budget in the first 5 months of this year. The deficit has reached 39.1 billion roubles compared with the total of 12.4 billion planned for this year.

Information circulated in the USSR parliament on Friday describes the situation in state finance as "disastrous". By the Finance Ministry's estimate the deficit may reach 140 billion roubles by the end of the year.

Losses of income in the past 5 months amount to 47 billion roubles, 31 of them in the republics' debt. The bulk of the debt falls on Russia - over 15 billion, the Ukraine 3.4 bln, kazakhstan - 2.1 billion and Uzbekistan - 600 million roubles.

Republic Aides at Economics Ministry Meeting

PM0507133591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[I. Zhagel report: "Union and Republic Ministries of Economics Starting To Operate on Ruins of Gosplan"]

[Text] The need to introduce qualitatively new mechanisms of national economic management has been spoken of many times and at various levels—thanks to which such formations as ministries of economics have appeared in the structure of the governments of the Union and the republics. The plan is that they should constitute the brain center of perestroika and its engine, as it were. And now, at last, their first joint session has been held in the former building of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], now the Ministry of Economics and Forecasting.

There were two items on the agenda. First of all, an attempt was made to assess the results with which the national economy will complete the present, complex year and the measures that must be taken to maximize these results. And, finally, the principles of the economy's functioning next year, when it is proposed to sharply reduce the share of the state order, to further liberalize prices, and to make the transition to internal ruble convertibility, were discussed.

Prior to the debate V. Shcherbakov, the country's first deputy prime minister, who also heads the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, declared that such meetings must be of a purely professional nature. The economy develops according to its own laws and can on no account be a hostage of political passions. However, the very fact that representatives of absolutely all the republics, including Georgia, Moldavia, Armenia, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, came to the enlarged session of the Economics Ministry Collegium attests that economists are taking a more sober view of questions of cooperation than is to be observed among politicians.

And yet probably no one can get entirely away from politics today. Thus, in the several options for the development of events in the national economy before the end of this year that were examined at the session the representatives of economic departments returned again and again to questions of relations between the republics and the center. In the end the conclusion was drawn that it is pointless to dwell on situations in which confrontation, the war of the laws, and the customs war will continue. Then the drop in production volumes will reach such a scale that it will be impossible to avoid new social explosions and strikes, and control over the economy will simply be lost.

Therefore it makes sense to speak only of the first option, which presupposes that the Union treaty will be concluded in the very near future and that joint, concerted fulfillment of the anticrisis program will begin. This means the restoration not only of interrepublic ties but also of approximately 70 percent of imported deliveries of raw materials, semimanufactures, and equipment, including from East European countries—which is at present one of the chief destabilizing factors in light industry.

But even in this case national income will fall almost 10 percent by the end of the year. True, the restoration of economic ties will help to attain the previous year's average daily production rate, and yet it will not be possible to fully make up the deficit. This is clearly visible in the example of the republics.

For example, S. Ling, chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic State Committee for Economics and Planning, cited these figures: Because of the breakdown in deliveries of raw materials and subassemblies during the spring months, over the year as a whole the republic's enterprises will be unable to produce more than 300,000 tires and 160,000 color television sets. In general,

speaking of consumer goods, losses here will total approximately 1 billion rubles.

Machinery and equipment for the countryside is a special issue. Owing to the violation of contract discipline there has been a considerable drop in production of trucks and tractors in Belorussia and this could have a substantial effect on the harvest results. Specialists pointed out that the harvest in the Soviet Union this year is to total just over 200 million tonnes of grain, i.e. some 20-30 percent less than last year. And if losses occur because of a shortage of agricultural equipment or for some other reasons, then a real threat of famine will arise and it will be necessary to reduce the livestock numbers still further and introduce the normed distribution of grain products.

Quite honestly, on listening to the mutual accusations of unobligingness on the part of leaders of the economic departments, you start to understand still better their dependence on each other. Therefore, however much talk there may be of independence, there is no getting away from the established high degree of specialization of farms in practically every republic, and their representatives themselves at the enlarged session of the USSR Economics Ministry Collegium demanded the strengthening of delivery discipline and the restoration of economic ties in the country. I would like politicians, above all, to heed this.

Incidentally, in addition to talk of how to survive the next few months, there was also constant discussion of the problem of the economy's transition to the market. This debate was based on the recently published USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution naming the main parameters for the functioning of the national economy in 1992.

The proposed level of the state order, for example, gave rise to many arguments. Next year, as is known, the processing sectors want to limit it to the level of 50 percent, and the extracting sectors to 70 percent. Diametrically opposite opinions were expressed in this regard.

Thus, Uzbekistan's representative objected altogether to any specific figures being indicated here. Russia's representative in turn declared that the republics must retain the right to license the export from their own territories of output produced over and above the state order—incidentally, it is not clear how this corresponds to the idea of a unified economic space. And a number of other republics even campaigned for an increase in the targets handed down from above.

The arguments in the latter case were roughly these: The normal working of a number of the most important sectors—the agro-industrial complex, for example—is inconceivable without metal, containers, and packaging materials, which means that they must be fully "incorporated" in the state order. However, as V. Shcherbakov remarked, we have already traveled this path.

In 1989, when there was talk of liberating enterprises, the country's government agreed to issue a state order for a state order, to to speak. And in the end it amounted to more than 100 percent for certain types of output. An end was thereby put to the market. Incidentally, it was precisely this that also largely undermined our export potential.

If oilmen had the right to independent control over at least part of their output, they would have been able to reequip themselves by means of imported purchases and would not have permitted such a drop in oil extraction. Therefore the state order must be restricted to some sensible limits for today. Everyone must find all that he needs on the free market, by selling at a profit the part remaining to him from the state order.

From the speeches by the representatives of the republics' economic departments it was possible to understand that there is still no agreement on the question of the level and principles of enterprise taxation in 1992. They did not all approve of the proposed abrupt liberalization of prices or the transition in January to internal ruble convertibility—this will bring serious problems for many. In particular, internal convertibility presupposes a reduction in the centralized redistribution of currency and its purchase at the market rate—which means a steep increase in the cost of the output of those enterprises which use imported raw materials and semimanufactures.

On the other hand, all concurred that it is necessary to urgently strengthen our monetary unit. The transition to the market will be simply impossible if the ruble does not start working. And concerted measures are needed here more than anywhere, because, if five or seven republics completely turn off the taps and there is a leak of financial resources in the others, then this money will, all the same, spread all over the country, forcing the rest to take countermeasures. Thus, when the restrictions on the consumption fund were lifted in response to the strikes in Belorussia, an increase in wages at once flared up throughout the Union. And dozens of such examples could be cited.

All these questions will also be discussed at further joint sessions of the Union and republic ministries of economics. But, summing up the first such meeting, it is possible to say that it differed favorably from the former sessions of the USSR Gosplan Collegium. Above all, in the way that its participants really tried to rise above problems of the moment, showing more concern for the principles of the economy's working than for who should produce how much of what.

And another point: There was manifestly no feeling of any one person's diktat at the meeting, for there were 16 equal participants. I believe that, given their desire to strengthen cooperation and their assimilation of the complex science of making compromises, we can secure an effective and useful organ for our economy which will really advance us toward the market.

Increase in Customs Tariffs Criticized

PM0307131591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by E. Guseynov: "Will Customs Service Make Us Richer"]

[Text] It would seem that everything that could be written has already been written about the new customs tariffs. But 1 July is approaching, when they will be put into operation, and you cannot help wanting to consider one last time the rationality and effectiveness of this economic innovation.

To what end does any modern state establish and regulate customs charges and tariffs? First, in an attempt to create the most favorable possible conditions for the economic activity of its own population and second in the desire to swell the budget with this revenue. Here the first task is undoubtedly the most important everywhere. After all, if the country's economy is in order then revenue will be found in one form or another.

In what cases from the viewpoint of state need is there any point in an increase in customs tariffs like the one which will be introduced in our country as of 1 July? When people want to protect the domestic market and national industry from foreign competitors. Usually that happens if one's own production of particular goods is only being set up and cannot yet fight foreign output on an equal basis. Or when the domestic market is oversaturated and the uncontrolled import of goods from abroad could lead to overstocking and crisis.

It is true that many present industrial giants, including Japan, have not created hothouse conditions for their own industry but immediately launched into the sea of competition, tempering their businessmen in the harsh but necessary struggle for a place in the sun.

And nonetheless in the world today there is virtually not a single country to be found, developed or developing, which has not used customs tariffs as a method of regulating the balanced development of its economy.

But there are no countries which would raise customs tariffs under conditions when their own economy could not satisfy their citizens' requirements for elementary necessities. And that is precisely what the Soviet Union's economy is like.

What would it seem necessary to do when the store shelves are empty, when our own goods enjoy an enormous, unlimited demand, when the population is reaching the point of hysteria in the attempt to buy at least something for rubles which are not backed up by any goods? One must allow whoever has the opportunity and the funds to calmly import consumer goods from abroad, satisfying his own requirements and in part, if there is some surplus, the needs of his compatriots. That is what happened in our country until recently and in various cities in the country commercial or more simply nonstate commission stores have appeared selling

imported items. Some of the goods imported by citizens have also reached the industrial goods market—for instance automobiles and electronic equipment.

For a long time the cost of items in commercial stores horrified us. But since the April increase in prices even a not very observant person has been able to notice that here too there has been overstocking. In some places prices have begun to fall. And it is at this moment that it has seemed to someone in the top echelon of the country's economic administration that even after a threefold increase in prices the people are still not paying enough into the treasury. They are not paying some taxes on imports. And so new, increased customs tariff rates are to be introduced.

I think there is no point in seeking the specific author of this "idea." Whoever he or they may be this decision has obviously not added to the authority of the present economic establishment and will scarcely bring positive economic results.

After all now with the growth in tariffs prices for consumer goods in commercial stores will inevitably increase. These stores operate according to market laws and customers will have to compensate for the increase in tariffs by an increase in prices. Prices will also rise on the market for several types of imported industrial goods a considerable proportion of which have been imported by private individuals. And that means that the overall level of prices will rise, not by much but still palpably, because everything in the economy is interconnected.

You recall how only recently we were promised that after April prices would not be increased any more "for the foreseeable future?" So as of 1 July these prices will be increased, indirectly and not directly, but they will be increased.

The ambiguity of the economic practice which is being implemented in the country also lies in the fact that in 1990 exports from the USSR of expensive Soviet-produced consumer goods in extremely short supply was maintained at a high level. These are the consumer goods which have been in such acutely short supply on the domestic market. According to the figures of the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations, last year 36.5 percent of cameras produced, 28.4 percent of automobiles, 27.8 percent of domestic clocks, and 13.5 percent of radio receivers were dispatched for export. Here the import of all these goods (except automobiles) and also of sewing machines actually increased in 1990.

Thus on the one hand store shelves are left empty in the chase after convertible currency and on the other the population's attempts to import at least some of what they need are also being restricted. They are being restricted in order to snatch something more from us in the form of import taxes. How can we understand this, to what logic is the economic activity of economic administrators subject—formal or, perhaps, dialectical logic? Or are we dealing with an incomprehensible but far-reaching design?

In any case neither we nor our country will become richer as a result of the introduction of the new tariffs.

Formation of Military-Industrial Exchange Noted

*LD0407103191 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1810 GMT 3 Jul 91*

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow 3 Jul (TASS)—A military-industrial exchange has been established in the Soviet Union. Journalists were told of this today at a news conference at the Space Flight Control Center.

One of the main tasks of the exchange is to defend, in market conditions, the military-industrial complex, which together with other enterprises in the Soviet Union is to emerge into the new wholesale market. Viktor Surikov, a member of the exchange council, reported that all the deals carried out at the exchange will be insured. An insurance company is to be an integral part of the exchange operation.

The main headquarters of the exchange will be in the Space Flight Control Center. The Russian goods and raw materials exchange, and the central scientific-research institute for machine-building are the organizers of the exchange.

Sergey Petrov, the main organizer of the exchange, addressed journalists. He reported that today, the founding capital of the exchange is R 30 million and the cost of one share is R 300,000.

Private Shipping Company Founded in Novorossiysk

*LD0507132291 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The first private shipping company has been founded in Novorossiysk. Its owners intend to acquire or lease vessels and effect small freight shipments that are not profitable for large shipping concerns.

KGB Takes Part in Exposing Economic Crimes

*OW0807062891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1930 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX] has information from the public relations department of the USSR KGB that in the first 6 months of this year 2,245 criminal cases have been started on the basis of material received from the KGB.

Most of the cases deal with theft of state property, violations in trade, and abuse of office. There are also

some cases of smuggling, and forgery of money and documents. 233 crimes are involved in breaking foreign exchange rules.

By now the courts have tried 567 cases, 368 of them ending in convictions. 477 criminals have been sentenced to various prison terms.

The KGB service of Moscow and its region has finished the investigation of the case involving managers of the Irkutsk and Krasnoyarsk savings bank, the development bank "21st Century", the cooperatives "Squirrel", "Impulse", "Student Union", and the joint venture "Choros".

Several criminal groups from those organisations practised large-scale theft and embezzlement in Moscow, Tashkent and other regions.

Members of cooperatives tried in that case had committed more than 60 instances of fraud, raising illegally about 25 million [MLN] roubles in the banks and about 12 mln roubles in certificates.

4 mln out of that sum were simply stolen, 865,000 spent in bribes. During the investigation about 5 mln roubles were confiscated from the accused.

Agricultural

Agriculture Minister Comments on Grain Harvest

*LD0507125391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1200 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Text] The Soviet Union will harvest less grain this year than last year, according to the Union Minister of Agriculture and Food Vyacheslav Chernomyanov. The minister, however, prefers not to give the possible harvest figures. It is difficult to make calculations, he said, because harvesting is just getting under way.

Speaking about the forecast by the U.S. CIA that grain output in the USSR will drop by 50 million tonnes, the minister noted that the CIA may also be wrong. Whatever the case, said the minister in an interview, the situation is shaping up adversely. Wheat fields have suffered from the drought in the Urals and western Siberia; but in the northern Caucasus, on the contrary, there have been tropical rains. Wheat has dropped to the ground, and that makes harvesting difficult.

CIA Forecast Questioned

*PM0507142591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
5 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1*

["Topic of the Day" roundup by V. Gavrichkin: "The CIA Forecasts, But the Peasant Does the Harvesting"]

[Text] The U.S. CIA forecast that this year's harvest in the Soviet Union will be worse than last year's and the country will get approximately 50 million tonnes less grain than last year was round the country in a flash,

thanks to our Central Television, and it caused many who heard the news to catch their breath. Already emotions have been aroused. I myself have heard people in the street and journalist colleagues asking questions like: "What are we going to eat in the winter?..." "Has the CIA ever been wrong in its forecasts?..." Or: "But why do we get these figures from the CIA, why do we not have our own information?..."

But let us look at the situation coolly, without emotion. I called V. Chernoyvanov, USSR minister of agriculture and food: "Vyacheslav Ivanovich, did you hear the report?"

"Yes, I did. But there was nothing new in it, as far as I could see. In fact, it is untrue that the CIA does not make mistakes. The forecasts are usually something like 10 percent off. But today... every week harvest data far more accurate than the CIA's land on my desk—from three sources overlapping one another. The only thing that is true is that we will harvest less grain than last year—in fact, the prime minister himself said this in a recent pronouncement. As for how much less, I do not want to go into details here or talk in terms of tonnes. In the first place, it is too early to give figures, because the weather could yet mess up any calculations. In the second place, a very great deal depends on how we go about the harvest work, how we operate..."

After all, a forecast is a forecast and work is work. Judging by the way the harvest is taking shape in the country's southern oblasts and what lessons it has taught from the outset, we can all expect some very, very hard work. All of us, but, above all, the peasants.

Here are just a couple of short reports from the fields:

Stavropol (IZVESTIYA own correspondent V. Oliyan-chuk). Harvest losses have been in evidence from the outset, in two forms. Some seem to be built in: They are due to a severe shortage of herbicides and plant protection agents. So you can particularly understand the pain and bitterness in the words uttered by a grain grower from Ipatyevskiy Rayon: "Is it true, then, that the country does not actually need our grain?" What else are you supposed to think when you see weed-infested tracts of wheat, when an apparently normal ear produces dust rather than grain when threshed—there was no top dressing for the crop to cause the grain to swell. The second reason is an age-old one: a shortage of fuel, spare parts, and transport. Vehicles are slow to arrive from neighboring republics of the North Caucasus and Karachayevo-Cherkessia, having been called in to help the Stavropol people on a contract basis; army vehicles are also expected.

Krasnodar (IZVESTIYA own correspondent A. Der-gachev). The harvest in the Kuban is being conducted in tropical downpour conditions (40-80 mm of precipitation in a few hours) and in terrible heat—up to 37 degrees in the shade. The rain has caused the grain to lodge, and now weeds are springing up everywhere. At the "Zavety Lenina" kolkhoz I saw them using a crane

and a tractor to drag a Don-1500 out of a barley field... The grain growers are doing their utmost to prevent harvest losses. But, compared with last year, approximately 14 quintals per threshed hectare have already been lost.

According to the most optimistic estimates, the Kuban will harvest 2.5 million tonnes less than last year, although they could have obtained as much this year as last. Indeed, what there is in the fields has yet to be brought in. The fuel situation is bad here, as it is with the neighbors, in Stavropol. Some 2,100 heavy-duty batteries for Don-1500's have not arrived. Just imagine: a veritable army of combines standing doing nothing—that means 20,000-25,000 hectares left unharvested or harvested late, with resultant massive losses of wheat.

There is some good news as well, though. The Cabinet of Ministers decided to allocate fuel from state reserves for the harvest—that should improve the situation. Extra transport is being mobilized, including army vehicles.

I would like to give the peasants something else to cheer them up, but there isn't anything. Some equipment and spare parts will roll in, very probably. But it is clear we can no longer wait and hope. We have to rely on what we have got. And on the grain growers' powers.

And also, on citizens. Whether one likes to admit it or not, whether people like to here it or not, the situation is such that the harvest this year has again to become a nationwide task. It is not just a matter of assistance from citizens. The city must not simply come to the countryside's assistance—it must do its duty. Leaving aside all the "can'ts," all the feuds, the rivalry, and economic accountability interests. If we do not do this the CIA forecast could even turn out to be too low.

Military Assistance for Harvest Effort Eyed

PM0807100591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

["Topical Interview" with Major General S. Bogomolov, chief of staff of leadership of motor transport battalions of the USSR Ministry of Defense, by correspondent Reserve Colonel F. Semyanovskiy; date, place not given; first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction: "Harvest-91: Soldiers Ready To Harvest"]

[Text] As in previous years, motor transport battalions of the USSR Ministry of Defense will set out for many parts of the country to gather the harvest. Our freelance correspondent asked Maj. Gen. S. Bogomolov, chief of staff of the leadership of USSR Ministry of Defense motor transport battalions, to describe how the preparations for the labor operation are going.

[Semyanovskiy] Sergey Markovich, this is not the first time that soldiers are going out to save the harvest. Readers would probably be interested to learn the results of the work of motor transport battalions last year.

[Bogomolov] In 1990 the USSR Ministry of Defense sent 94 motor transport battalions to gather the harvest. What lies behind this figure? I will start with the end result. Working in the Russian Federation and Kazakhstan, military drivers transported 30.6 million tonnes of agricultural freight, including 16.8 million tonnes of grain.

If all the farms where our servicemen were working had ensured the maximum loading of motor transport, the results would have been far greater. The press everywhere is now writing that labor efficiency is low in agriculture and there is no clear-cut planning, monitoring of the fulfillment of adopted decisions, or seeing things through to the end. Unfortunately, military drivers encountered all of this last year too. This is why, compared with 1989, each battalion transported, on average, 18,000 tonnes less agricultural freight in 1990. A detailed analysis showed that the average loading of trucks stood at 60-70 percent, and only because the leaders of krays and oblasts had asked for far more transport than they could use. If you add to this the low standard of organization of work on farms and the shortage of fuel and lubricants, then the picture will be complete.

In preparing for the new harvest campaign we have made every effort to avoid similar mistakes. But our efforts are not enough, and good organizational work is needed on the part of leaders of local soviets, ministries, and departments.

[Semyanovskiy] How has work begun this year?

[Bogomolov] In accordance with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution and the USSR defense minister's order, this year we are preparing 80 motor transport battalions and will send them to gather the harvest.

Approximately 50,000 people will be drafted from the reserve to cope with the target. A well-considered approach to this work has been taken in Kazakhstan. By decision of the republic's president, the draft will be carried out throughout its territory. Last year this had a positive impact on the organization and efficiency of work. The picture looked far worse in Russia then. Despite the General Staff's insistent proposals to draft reserve servicemen from the territory of the whole republic, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers did not adopt that decision. Recruitment took place mainly at the battalions' places of work. Here the leaders of a number of rayons and enterprises simply sabotaged the draft, at times wrecking it. People with low moral qualities, including a number of drunkards and shirkers, were frequently sent to the battalions. When battalions were redeployed to other rayons, reserve servicemen would return to their former workplaces on their own initiative, leaving equipment to the mercy of fate.

[Semyanovskiy] On the other hand, there are probably no problems over manning battalions with regular servicemen?

[Bogomolov] We have endeavored to take a particularly responsible approach to the selection of subunit commanders. Regimental commanders or their deputies are appointed to the posts of battalion commanders. Cadres are selected for the posts of company commanders in a purposeful manner. Painstaking organizational work is being done to ensure not only the qualitative formation of battalions but also the efficient, trouble-free conveyance of personnel by railroad. In addition, it is necessary to resolve problems of food and clothing supplies and medical support services. The problem of fuel and lubricants must not be taken off the agenda either. Commanders, political workers, and party and Lenin Communist Youth League organizations are devoting a lot of time and effort to strengthening military discipline, order, and organization.

[Semyanovskiy] When is the operation planned for, and where will the motor transport battalions be working?

[Bogomolov] Some 30,000 vehicles will be sent to the Russian Federation. Battalions will arrive in Stavropol Krai and Astrakhan, Volgograd, Saratov, Belgorod, Voronezh, Kursk, Lipetsk, and Tambov Oblasts before 5 July. Corresponding battalions will be concentrated in Penza, Orenburg, Orel, Ulyanovsk, and Samara Oblasts and Bashkiria before 10 July. In Ryazan, Novosibirsk, and Omsk Oblasts and Altay and Krasnoyarsk Krays before 15 July.

And another address—Kazakhstan. A real battle for the harvest will be waged there, following the experience of the last one. To harvest the grain without losses we are sending more than 10,000 pieces of equipment to Uralsk, Kokchetav, Kustanay, North Kazakhstan, Turgay, and Tselinograd Oblasts.

It is not without grounds that we are reckoning on success. For the relations that we maintain with the government of Kazakhstan are of a businesslike, constructive nature. The tasks which we will resolve are constantly in the field of vision of President N. Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan.

Military Vehicles Dispatched for Harvest

914B0203A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
28 Jun 91 p 1

["On the Assignment of Trucks for Harvesting the 1991 Crop. In the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"—SELSKAYA ZHIZN heading]

[Text] A resolution of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers says:

1. To obligate the USSR Ministry of Defense to assign 40,000 trucks, including 30,000 to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and 10,000 to the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] from the ministry's available fleet for hauling grain, sugar beets, feed, and other agricultural products. Specific deadlines for the arrival of the trucks at their destinations and the

duration of their work at the harvesting shall be coordinated with the governments of the republic, taking into account the ripening of grains and other crops.

To form motor transport battalions with the trucks assigned to harvesting the 1991 crop and to staff them with drivers and officers in numbers sufficient to support one and one-half shifts of work, as well as to provide the necessary means of repair.

2. To authorize the USSR Ministry of Defense to call up from the reserves for a three-month period of active duty the necessary number of military reservists with appropriate professions who are not directly involved in farm work and work in the transportation organizations of the agroindustrial complex in the RSFSR and the Kazakh SSR in order to staff the motor transport battalions.

3. To maintain the pay which the servicemen drafted for harvesting received as of the day they left a military unit for the entire duration of their detail with the exception of increased position salaries for service in remote and high-mountain areas of the USSR, as well as in regions and localities which were subjected to radioactive contamination in conjunction with the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station, and to maintain the positions held (jobs) and the average wage of activated military reservists at the places of their employment for the entire duration of their stay with the motor transport battalions.

4. The USSR Ministry of Railways shall ensure the transportation of motor transport battalions on requests filed by the USSR Ministry of Defense, their delivery to new areas of work and back to the points of permanent deployment by rail, over distances exceeding 500 kilometers, in special trains which shall include passenger cars provided for carrying personnel.

5. To acknowledge that before 25 June 1991, the RSFSR Council of Ministers and the Kazakh SSR Cabinet of Ministers will allocate to the USSR Ministry of Defense, on request of the latter, the necessary funding to meet the outlay for forming the motor transport battalions and transporting them to the work areas. Final settlements with the USSR Ministry of Defense on outlays for the formation, redeployment, and disbandment of the motor transport battalions, and expenditures entailed by calling up and discharging military reservists, which are not covered by the monies generated by the motor transport battalions, shall be effected no later than one month after the completion of harvesting work.

6. To allow the USSR Ministry of Defense to pay the following to servicemen and persons subject to military service obligation who are drafted for work associated with hauling grain and other agricultural products in keeping with the present resolution from the monies due for the volume of freight haulage work done by the battalions:

a) per diem to officers, warrant officers, and petty officers, including activated reservists, and servicemen

in extended military service for the entire period of time associated with harvesting, including the time of travel and the formation and disbandment of the motor transport battalions, at rates established by the legislation in effect for service trips within the USSR, and to soldiers, sailors, sergeants, and ranking noncommissioned officers called up for active duty from the reserves in the amount of 50 percent of the above rates.

To provide additional meals worth up to three rubles [R] per person per day to soldiers, sailors, sergeants, and ranking noncommissioned officers in compulsory military service and the reserves in the period of work on hauling agricultural products;

b) financial remunerations:

to drivers—servicemen in compulsory military service and driver-reservists called up for active service from the reserves for the actually performed volume of transportation in ton-kilometers within the limits of shift performance standards, in an amount of 25 percent of the wages, and for the overfulfillment of the shift performance standards in the amount of 100 percent of the wages calculated on the basis of the current pay grades;

to soldiers, sailors, sergeants, and ranking noncommissioned officers in compulsory military service and the reserves (except for drivers involved in the transportation of agricultural products) in amounts of not more than R60 per month on the condition that a battalion (company) meets and exceeds the quota set for it;

to officer personnel, warrant officers, petty officers, and servicemen in extended military service in the motor transport battalions, operational groups, and the headquarters for managing the motor transport battalions of the USSR Ministry of Defense in an amount of not more than 40 percent of their position salaries, and to officer personnel, warrant officers, and petty officers called up for active duty from the reserves in amounts of up to R70 per month, on condition that the corresponding subunits (units) meet and exceed quotas for the haulage of grain and other agricultural products;

c) additional monetary remunerations:

to drivers for carrying the freight of the national economy in the opposite or same direction in an amount of 25 percent of the earnings calculated in keeping with pay rates in effect;

officer personnel, warrant officers, and petty officers, servicemen in extended military service for organizing the haulage of cargo in the same direction in amounts of up to 10 percent of their position salaries, and officer personnel, warrant officers, and petty officers called up for active duty from the reserves in amounts of up to R20 per month.

7. To recommend that ministries and departments, enterprises and organizations give servicemen and military reservists who took part in work associated with the haulage of agricultural products paid leave of up to 10

calendar days upon their return to the places of permanent service (work) as compensation for unused days off in the period of harvesting work.

8. The RSFSR Council of Ministers and the Kazakh SSR Cabinet of Ministers, together with the Ministry of Defense, shall resolve the issue of allocating agricultural products for payments in kind or sales to military units for the funds earned by the motor transport battalions during harvesting.

9. The Ministry of Economics and Forecasting of the USSR shall envisage in the draft plan for 1992 the replenishment of the transferable stocks of foodstuffs, clothing, and related gear of the USSR Ministry of Defense, which will be spent to ensure the measures envisaged by the present resolution.

10. With a view to restoring trucks and repair means used in harvesting the 1991 crop, the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Building, and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Processing Industry shall deliver to the USSR Ministry of Defense, at its request and in excess of its quotas, in the fourth quarter of 1991 and the first quarter of 1992, spare parts worth R10 million (including 1,000 engines), 5,000 accumulator batteries, 10,000 sets of car tires, R500,000 worth of cable products, and R600,000 worth of equipment and implements.

The USSR Ministry of Defense shall envisage the recoupment of outlays for the material and technical resources indicated in contracts signed with enterprises and organizations of the agroindustrial complex for harvesting work.

11. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers points out to the USSR Ministry of Defense, executive committees of the local soviets of people's deputies, agroindustrial committees and associations, managers of collective and state farms and procurement and transportation organizations that it is necessary to ensure the highly productive use of military transportation for harvesting the 1991 crop and hauling agricultural freight, to implement everywhere advanced methods for organizing motor vehicle haulage and for preventing the idling of cars during loading and unloading operations.

Aircraft Readied for Produce Delivery

914B0203C Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
29 Jun 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has instructed the USSR Ministry of Defense to ensure the transportation in 1991 of fresh fruit and vegetable products on its

planes from southern areas to other regions of the country in keeping with contracts signed with freight shippers (freight receivers).

Payments for the transportation of fresh fruit and vegetables on the planes of the USSR Ministry of Defense are made at the tariffs of the USSR MGA [Ministry of Civil Aviation] for the transportation of freight on regular flights, without taking into account the outlays for flying planes to the airports of loading. In the process, payments should be made for the takeoffs and landings of military planes at the airports of civil aviation.

It was resolved to exempt the Ministry of Defense from transferring to the union budget 70 percent of the funds received from freight shippers (freight receivers) for transporting fruit and vegetable products.

The USSR MGA was instructed to ensure the unimpeded servicing of the USSR Ministry of Defense planes carrying fruit and vegetable products on terms in effect.

The USSR Ministry of Material Resources and the USSR Ministry of Defense shall resolve the issue of allocating aviation fuel which is necessary for transporting fresh fruits and vegetables, as envisaged in the present instructions.

Military Region Harvest Preparations Reported

914B0203B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
26 Jun 91 p 1

[Article by TASS correspondent B. Belyakov: "The Grain Battalions"]

[Text] VOLGA-URALS MILITARY DISTRICT, 25 June. A district-wide conference of logistics commanders and specialists has been held at which the issues of preparations by "grain battalions" for harvesting were discussed.

As specialists indicate, much additional machinery and personnel will be needed to transport grain this summer. At present the formation of six motor transport battalions is coming to an end. The servicemen are preparing to engage in a harvesting campaign in an organized manner, giving it their all.

Scientific

Academy of Technological Sciences Established

LD0707115691 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT
7 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Dunayeva]

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—The world's first International Academy of Technological Sciences established in Moscow aims to help prominent Soviet and foreign technology researchers pool their efforts.

These efforts will be directed above all to speed up the development of science-intensive technologies in the interests of the bio-agrarian complex and the technology of electronic monetary turnover.

"The level of civilization in every country is determined by the development and use of new high technologies," the academy president Vladimir Alfeyev told TASS.

"Those who have realised it have performed a giant leap in raising people's living standards and economic independence. Advanced Western countries and Japan are examples of this.

"The Russian Academy of Technological Sciences which initiated the creation of the first international academy, has a solid base of defence, technological, research and production associations to lean upon. The process of hi-tech conversion must first of all play a major role in raising Soviet people's living standards."

The International Academy of Technological Sciences has already begun work. Negotiations are under way with the president of the Italian Forum for Information Technologies Jesualdo le Molli on the development of a programme for Russia's computer electronic money. The implementation of this programme will ensure a painless transition of the country to a market.

There are some ready-made programmes as well. One is the biocentre complex developed jointly by Dutch, American and Soviet aerospace enterprises.

This complex is a module, unmanned technological production of elite potato brands. One is already in operation near Tula, some others will be established in central Russia and later in other regions of the country.

Priorities for the fundamental research in high, science-intensive technologies will be determined at the first international conference and the new science-intensive technologies-92 exhibition which are due to open in Moscow in August 1992. Both events will facilitate the wide spread of ecologically clean technologies in this country on the basis of integration with foreign science.

Harvest Forecasting Experiment in Kursk

LD0707044291 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1454 GMT 6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Shchiglenko]

[Text] Kursk, 6 July (TASS)—Forecasting productivity of agricultural crops with the help of space photographs is just one of the directions of the "Kursk-91" international satellite-assisted experiment which started today near Kursk on the territory of the Central Black Earth Zone biospherical reserve.

For the first time this year along with scientists from the USSR, Bulgaria, Hungary, Germany, Czechoslovakia,

Poland, Vietnam, and Cuba—the traditional research participants—colleagues from the United States will also take part in the work.

Scientists are to carry out complex observations of the biological productivity of the reserve's steppes, as well as arable land. By comparing characteristics of the same plots of land surface taken at different altitudes, scientists might find a universal "key" to deciphering space photographs.

Materials obtained in the course of "Kursk-91" will help to improve remote models for forecasting harvests, as well as changes in the natural environment influenced by the individual's activities.

Human Impact on Seismic Stability Debated

PM0307155791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jul 91
Second Edition p 6

[Correspondent Z. Kadymbekov report: "Earthquake to Order?"]

[Text] Baku—How far does human industrial activity affect seismicity far below the earth's surface? Can outside interference in nature's "internal affairs" cause an earthquake? An international conference held in Baku by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Earth Physics and the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences Geology Institute was devoted to discussing these topical problems. Prominent seismologists from India, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union took part.

The reports delivered at the conference and researchers' statements enable us to presuppose and in some cases to assert that increases in seismic activity are the result of human economic activity. In particular, a disturbance may occur deep within the earth as a result of the construction of large dams and artificial reservoirs, and also the injection of liquid into deep boreholes. Some shifts in the earth's crust may also be brought about by underground nuclear explosions, drastic fluctuations in the water level in enclosed reservoirs, and certain other things that have a direct or indirect effect on the seismic situation.

"An increase in seismic activity is due in some cases," prominent Indian scientist Doctor Kharsh Gupta claimed, "to the creation of large reservoirs. Subsidence in the base of these reservoirs under the weight of the water causes movement in the earth's crust and successive—sometimes weak and sometimes quite strong—seismic tremors. In the sixties devastating earthquakes took place near three large dams—Kariba (Zambia), Kremaston (Greece), and Koyna (India). Yet they are all in regions that are consistently calm seismically—which is evidence of a link between earthquakes and the presence of large dams in a vicinity, moreover predominantly of the kind of dams in which abrupt jumps in the water level are recorded. These phenomena have been confirmed on a number of occasions in the past, as illustrated by the studies carried out by a special

UNESCO working group that has been carrying out scientific development work in this field for more than 20 years now."

The hypothesis that underground nuclear explosions cause disturbances deep within the earth also arouses great interest. In particular, the ill-famed test range in Semipalatinsk is not least to blame for the increase in seismicity in the Caucasus and Central Asia, in the opinion of Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences A. Nikolayev and Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences I. Kerimov.

Hypotheses that amateurs regard as sensational and fantastic at first glance are, in the scientists' view, quite logical and feasible. I. Kerimov voiced the following idea: The massive bombings in the Persian Gulf area may have sparked off the earthquake in Georgia. They, as it were, speeded up a process taking place in the depths of the Caucasus mountains.

"At the same time, with the beginning of the all-out air raids on Iraq," a scientist said, "the Geology Institute's sensitive instruments recorded clear changes in noise deep down in the earth, moreover the nature of the signals attested quite definitely to the artificial source of the disturbance. The instruments continued to receive these signals even after the air raids on Iraqi cities had come to an end."

But why Georgia, thousands of kilometers from the theater of combat operations? In the scientist's opinion, the process whereby powerful underground vibrations are "prepared" in this zone took its natural course with a tendency to increase, and seismic waves from the bombing runs only incited and speeded it up. On the principle that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. It is not impossible that for the same reason there may be earthquakes over the next six or eight months in existing seats of tension in Iraq, Turkey, western Iran, and adjacent areas which could later bring about more intensive events and a series of earthquakes, since scientists believe that the earthquakes themselves may also cause fresh underground tremors.

The study and forecasting of increased seismic activity is one of the main problems that science has brought forward in the era of accelerated technical progress.

Military

Decree Boosts President's Influence on Army

PM0207140691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[V. Litovkin article: "Why the President Needs the Military Councils"]

[Text] It is well known that the Army is at the center of public attention. It is also obvious that events in and around the Army are often at the epicenter of social passions. So it was recently, during the elections of the

Russian president and vice president, when generals and colonels joined in the political struggle for these posts. It is the same practically every time anyone in uniform mounts the rostrum of the Congress or the country's Supreme Soviet...

But one event of recent days, I notice, has for some reason not provoked appropriate public interest, although it is significant enough. I am talking about the provision—approved by a USSR presidential decree of 22 June—on military councils in the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR KGB troops, the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops, and the railroad troops.

Why did this decree appear at precisely this moment? After all, the military councils in armies, districts, fleets, and flotillas have existed as an organ of collective leadership of troops from, so to speak, time immemorial, haven't they? The answer to this question can be interpreted on at least two levels.

The first, external aspect. The fact is that a lot of water has flowed under the bridge since 1958, when the previous provision came into force. The Army and Navy have changed, they have acquired the Strategic Missile Forces, the Defense Ministry's Space Units, and other troops, to which the provision apparently did not apply. Furthermore radical changes are taking place in the Armed Forces associated with the military reform and with the change in their role in society. And this too is an important reason for drawing up a new provision.

But the new provision also differs in another, fundamental way. It is being put into effect not by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, as used to be the practice, but by the head of state.

Does that mean that the Communist Party's leadership of the Armed Forces as the principle of military building has ceased to exist? I would not be in too much of a hurry to give a simple answer to that. Communists—whether some people like it or not—today have the monopoly of influence on the masses in the Army. They constitute an overall majority among officers. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary, who is also president of the USSR, played an active part in the work of the recent All-Army Party Conference, and the secretary of the All-Army Party Committee has been elected to Politburo membership. This was the first time such an event had occurred in the CPSU.

But all the same. The new provision on military councils that has been published in the press, and the point which states that military councils are formed by the USSR president, unequivocally establishes an essential legal norm for a civilized society. In any country the Army is an instrument of the state, and only the state, in the shape of its highest state organs—the president, the Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet—has the right to control military structures.

What other characteristics of the new provision should be noted? The fact that apart from military officials—commanders or commanders in chief, their first deputies, chiefs of staffs, and chiefs of military-political directorates or departments—the military councils may also include civilians: presidents of republics, chairmen of Supreme Soviets or their Presidiums, and also heads of government and chairmen and deputy chairmen of kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies and of their executive committees. Formerly, military councils included secretaries of obkoms [oblast party committees] and kraykoms [kray party committees] and of the Communist Party Central Committees of the republics on whose territory the troops were stationed.

The provision also says that military councils should collaborate in their work with local social organizations and movements. After all, their main task is to ensure the country's reliable defense. And that is a matter for the whole people and the whole state.

Incidentally, resolutions of the military council will be adopted by democratic means—by a majority of votes of those present at the session. This is yet another guarantee that not only the interests of generals and colonels, but also those of the civilian population will be taken into account. This procedure does not, however, mean that the principle of unity of command as the cornerstone of military building is now being revoked. It was, is, and will remain the basis on which performance, organization, responsibility, and discipline are maintained in the Army and Navy, although—as we all know very well—they need to be improved considerably.

Let me add this. The provision also stresses that the military council's decisions are binding on all its members and on other officials of the military administration organs. Such decisions are formalized in an order and directive signed by the commander in chief or commander and the chief of staff, or on military-political matters by the commander and the chief of the military-political directorate or department.

Of course, situations could arise in which a member of the military council is not in agreement with the collective decision. The provision envisages this right. But in that case it is the duty of that individual to report his opinion to the president, prime minister, and defense minister. And they will "dot the i's", so to speak.

...Of course, there are very many problems in our Army today. They can not be resolved at a session of the military council. They can only be resolved with a change in the situation in our society, of which the Army is an integral part. But there are also purely army matters, local matters, which the military councils have the right and duty to resolve. The fact that their membership will be approved on the submission of the defense minister by the president himself is, it seems to me, remarkable.

Anyone who thought the country's president was losing the levers for controlling the Army is profoundly mistaken. The new decree on military councils means a strengthening of his influence on the situation in the Armed Forces. But that should surprise no one.

That is how it should be, in a rule-of-law state.

Navy 'May Be Weakened' by Training Cuts

PM0307133591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[“Topical Interview” with Captain First Rank B. Tsybenko, chief of a Naval Main Staff section, by Captain Third Rank Yu. Gladkevich; date and place of interview not stated: “The Naval Training Network: The Start of Reforms?”]

[Text] The concept of military reform elaborated by the USSR Ministry of Defense envisages a sharp increase in the quality of the training of personnel on compulsory service in the Army and Navy.

Does the state of the naval training network guarantee the solution of such a task? Captain First Rank V. Tsybenko, chief of a Naval Main Staff section, answers this question and others put to him by our correspondent at the request of the editorial office.

[Gladkevich] The Navy is transferring to a two-year period of service for seamen and petty officers. What has changed in this connection in the system of training personnel on compulsory service?

[Tsybenko] As a rule, seamen and petty officers successfully have become high-grade specialists capable of resolving combat tasks within a period of three years of service (of these two and a half are on a ship or in a unit). The reduction of the period of service will reduce by exactly a year the time which seamen and petty officers will have to perfect the specialization that they receive in the training detachment.

Hence the need to intensify the process of training specialists in the naval training network to the utmost degree. But is it in the power of the teacher-commander of a platoon, who has 60 men under him, to do this?

Having obtained the approval of the Armed Forces General Staff, we reformed the previous structures. The platoon was reduced to 30 men and the teacher-commander received a warrant officer-teacher and a deputy platoon commander to assist him. The platoon can now be broken down into at least three groups for practical lessons, and a separate leader will be involved with each group.

[Gladkevich] But after all, Boris Ivanovich, today the naval training detachments and schools need to be re-equipped, since at the moment they are far from having state-of-the-art equipment. Does the naval training network possess the resources for this?

[Tsybenko] That is a difficult question. Of course there are training detachments and schools in the Navy that possess state-of-the-art equipment, as you put it. But there are not many of them. The majority, as a rule, are short: Training facilities are outdated, the average amount of equipment lacking is 45 percent. The situation has not changed for several years.

We are not expecting any changes for the better in the foreseeable future. The country's economic difficulties and the violation of economic ties have hit the Navy hard. And in general the material conditions for reorganizing the system of training seamen and petty officers can hardly be called satisfactory. Because of the price rises, the expenditure involved in training and classes has automatically risen—but the allocated sums have remained unchanged. The training of teachers in the Navy has now become much more expensive (without compensation).

Of course we submitted our proposals on this subject to the naval financial service. But we are assessing the Navy's possibilities in a sober way. And the following question arises: How are we to improve the quality of the training of seamen and petty officers when not just the period of service, but also the resources are being reduced?

[Gladkevich] Does it not follow from what you have said, that the reorganization of the naval training network and the system of training personnel on compulsory service will be purely formal?

[Tsybenko] That is the conclusion that springs to mind. Of course we will be forced to somehow extricate ourselves from this because, after all, you cannot trust unskilled people with equipment. It is not out of the question that we will have to embark on the path of giving the specialist a minimum of knowledge and a maximum of operational skills, which will ensure his readiness to perform his functions somewhat mechanically, no doubt, but efficiently and well. However, this is certainly not part of the tradition of our naval personnel training.

[Gladkevich] Apart from anything else, do you still have your previous problems with the quality of the teaching staff at training detachments and school? Rumors are even circulating in the Navy that they are sometimes virtually no better than sinks for officers who are rejected from ships...

[Tsybenko] There really is such a problem. But it is not as acute as the people who are passing these rumors around are trying to make out. Furthermore, at present the naval command and the cadre organs are taking active measures so that the training detachments and schools are full of officers who have the necessary practical and moral qualities to work in the naval training network.

Moreover, the Navy, like all the Armed Forces, is now being reduced. Many forces are being liberated, and their

influx is beginning to be felt in our detachments and schools. These are experienced officers from ships, although admittedly they are undertrained as teachers.

And here is a problem that is worrying us much more—the lack of special teacher training for teachers in the training detachments and schools. I do not want to say that they do not possess any knowledge or skills in teaching at all, but it is beyond any doubt that the majority are lacking in serious preinduction training.

Until recently our teachers, unlike those working within the system of higher military educational institutions, did not have the possibility of improving their teacher training except by independent work by themselves. Apparently the situation will soon change: The commander in chief of the Navy recently approved our proposal to create special courses at two naval institutions of higher education. Now the matter is to be resolved by higher bodies.

But even in the event of their adopting a positive decision, it will take time to get these courses going. And changes—radical ones at that—are needed today in the system of training specialists.

So that the reorganization of the system of training the personnel on compulsory service must be assessed as just the beginning of reforms in this sphere. Whether we want to or not, we will have to have a radical rather than a cosmetic reorganization both of the naval training network and the whole system of training seamen and petty officers. And we cannot carry this out without additional resources.

The Navy is not asking for unnecessary resources, but we are not even being given the most modest resources at the moment. A package of documents which must be adopted was sent to the USSR Council of Ministers back in February of last year, and it was not submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet until September. The fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet went by, and then the fifth...

The inefficiency and what I would even call the inability to organize things on the part of the country's supreme legislative organ give rise to worries that, in this difficult time, the Navy may be weakened more than it is strengthened.

Round Table on Foreign Threat, Persian Gulf

91UM0762A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Roundup prepared by Major M. Pogorelyy: "The USSR's Foreign Policy in a Changing World"]

[Text] This became a central topic in the debate on international problems at the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA festival.

And this debate was conducted around two issues which are, it might have seemed, far removed from one

another: "The Military Threat for the USSR. Is There Such Today?" and "The War in the Persian Gulf: Causes and Consequences".

Opening the discussion on the first problem, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer M.A. Ponomarev, noted the importance of a correct evaluation of the degree and nature of the military danger for the formulation of military-political doctrine and, accordingly, the directions of military organizational development in the USSR. The opinions of our readers expressed in letters to the editor (and also heard in the course of the debate in M. Gorkiy Park) are very diverse and are at times polar opposites. Some people believe a threat is looming over the USSR in the face of which we are unjustifiably disarming unilaterally, are consenting to the signing of unequal treaties, have lost our allies, and are leaving East Europe. Others, on the contrary, maintain that under current conditions there is practically no danger to the USSR and that for this reason we not only can but should sharply cut back the armed forces, reduce military spending, and accelerate the conversion of the defense industry.

Ye.T. Gudkov, candidate of economic sciences and senior scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economy and International Relations Institute, a participant in the debate, believes, for example, that there is far greater danger today not in the military, but in the economic sphere where the positions of the Soviet Union are, as is generally known, far from the strongest. Here, in his opinion, are the real "vital interests" of states, and the situation should be evaluated in accordance with the "geo-economic" map of the world.

Candidate of Historical Sciences K.E. Sorokin, head scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute, also began discussion of the possible danger for our country with the material prerequisites of the unleashing of a war: Do they exist today? In his opinion, not as yet. But if the Soviet Union lags behind in an increase not in the quantity but in the quality of modern arms systems, the gap between the security of the USSR and other countries will increase noticeably.

The profound relationship between the country's domestic stability and its international security was discussed by Major General G.V. Batenin, military adviser to the CPSU Central Committee. He expressed the belief that our security today has already been undermined by the conflicts on a national and, more precisely, political basis, which is frequently camouflaged by "national singularities." The achievement of domestic harmony, in his opinion, would also markedly reduce the likelihood of military actions against the USSR from outside.

The essence of the USSR's military-political strategy under current conditions was explained to those present by Major General V.I. Chepurinov, chief of a directorate of the Center for Operational and Tactical Research of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. He observed, inter-

alia, that thanks to the establishment in the world arena of civilized standards of international relations, it had been possible in recent years to reduce considerably the level of East-West military confrontation and not only put an end to the "cold war," but also take, albeit the first, but nonetheless concrete steps in respect of a curbing of the arms race and disarmament. The security of the Soviet Union, as also of the other countries involved in this process, has undoubtedly benefited from this.

Conducting a discussion on problems of the country's security on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War, the participants in the discussion were naturally unable to pass by in silence the lessons of those dreadful years for our motherland and the whole world. As O.A. Rzhesheskiy, doctor of historical sciences, vice president of the History of World War II International Committee, and head of a department of the USSR Academy of Sciences General History Institute, observed, answering questions in readers' letters to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and heard from the floor, territorial claims on the USSR are indeed today being expressed in a number of East European countries. We should, however, he emphasized, make the distinction as to who is raising these problems. They are not, after all, government but small extremist circles. The situation should not be dramatized or the danger exaggerated, he said. But neither can it be forgotten that these countries fought in World War II against the USSR, and for this reason the political roots of the affairs of today should be sought in the events of half a century ago.

Summing up the discussion, M.A. Ponomarev observed that in the approach to the problem of the presence or absence of a military danger for the USSR today it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that assertions such as "the international situation has changed" are not entirely correct. The situation is changing—this is more accurate. And we are living in a transitional period: We are all in motion toward a new world order. But everyone's understanding of this order is as yet different, nor is everyone moving "in step." Therefore speaking of the absence today of any military danger whatever for the Soviet Union is, alas, premature.

Problems of the interaction of peoples of the world in the creation of a new world order and the correlation of peaceful political and military steps on this path were actively discussed by the participants in another debate, also conducted by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's foreign department and devoted to the causes and consequences of the war in the Persian Gulf.

Newspaper observer Lieutenant Colonel R.Z. Mustafin, who opened the debate, called the attention of those assembled to the fact that this was the first regional conflict since the end of the "cold war" and that the USSR and the United States had for the first time acted not as rivals and competitors, but as partners interacting for the purpose of finding a solution to this conflict. To many of our fellow citizens this position of the USSR

came largely as a surprise. Some people accused the Soviet leadership of the "betrayal of our friend and ally." Others, on the contrary, demanded the participation of our armed forces in the war on the side of the anti-Iraq coalition.

Their opinions, also varying greatly, on the true causes of the conflict were expressed by Lieutenant Colonel Yu.L. Tegin, candidate of philosophical sciences and deputy chief of a department of the USSR Defense Ministry's Military History Institute ("the economic expansion of a regional superpower—Iraq—supported by the West"); journalist and international affairs specialist A.S. Alekseyev ("the unresolved nature of the Near East problem altogether, in the broad sense, the Arab-Israeli conflict"); Candidate of Economic Sciences S.Yu. Kazennov, scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences World Economy and International Relations Institute ("the collapse of the bipolar world and the United States's desire to show the third world that it has been deprived of Soviet support"); and Colonel V.F. Politov, observer of ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOGO OBOZRENIYA ("a specific manifestation of the American 'selective deterrence' doctrine").

Just as diverse also were the opinions of the participants in the discussion concerning the position of the USSR and, most importantly, what we gained and what we lost by occupying the known position in connection with the conflict in the Gulf. Thus Lt. Col. Yu.L. Tegin, proceeding from the "foreign policy is the art of winning friends, not unleashing wars" principle, is convinced that our positions in the Near East have strengthened. Only the Soviet Union was taking steps to hold back the conflict from a possible unraveling in time and space to the level of a world war. The USSR has never waged war against the Arabs, and this tradition was not violated this time either.

A.S. Alekseyev, on the contrary, believes that our positions, particularly in the Near East, have been shaken. The United States did what it wanted and "tweaked our nose" here. But S.Yu. Kazennov is convinced that it should altogether be a question not of whose side we were on, but of the extent to which the Soviet Union is involved in the Near East conflict. According to him, the country's domestic economic difficulties require a sharp down-scaling of Soviet involvement in the processes of this region and of the third world as a whole. The "healthy isolationism of the USSR," he surmises, would be evaluated positively both in our country and in the West.

A military analysis of the salient features of the conflict in the Gulf was offered for the attention of those assembled by Major General G.S. Shevchenko, chief of a department of the Center for Operational and Tactical Research of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff. He observed, *inter alia*, that this war was one of the shortest in the 20th century, but also one of the most devastating in terms of the defeat of one of the antagonists—Iraq in this case. Maj. Gen. G.S. Shevchenko spoke about both the particular features of the air campaign of the anti-Iraq coalition and the multinational force's ground operation. He also convincingly exposed the talk about the

"superiority" of American weapons to Soviet weapons, showing that with which the Iraqis were armed and how they used what they had.

It is impossible in a brief account, of course, even to enumerate all the problems discussed over several hours. There was in addition a multitude of questions, and the particular opinions of the audience were heard—thanks to the "free microphone" everyone present was able to set forth his viewpoint and his understanding of the problems. With those, however, who were unable to avail themselves of this opportunity KRASNAYA ZVEZDA will conduct a discussion on its pages.

Changes in Military Defense Industry Viewed

LD0607225491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] For a long time we used to associate the work of the defense industry purely with manufacturing weapons and military equipment. Only a few of us may know about the civilian potential of the military defense industry. In this country it manufactures 50 percent of motorcycles, 30 percent of refrigerators, and 12 percent of tape recorders. Now, in connection with conversion, when the number of defense and military orders is falling, many enterprises of this industry are being forced to change over to new economic forms.

The whole world knows the Flight Control Center near Moscow, but very few know that today only a fraction of the enormous opportunities created when the Flight Control Center was set up is being used. [video shows interior of Flight Control Center] Suffice it to say that the Flight Control Center was designed to cope with five or six manned craft in space simultaneously. But that is not the case now. At present there is a shortage of money, not only to maintain spacecraft. Sometimes there is no money to pay staff wages. The same situation exists at almost all enterprises in the military-industrial complex. As the saying goes, however, every cloud has a silver lining.

The budget of the Soviet military industry, which has been very considerably cut, has provoked retaliation from defense industry enterprises. They have joined forces in a joint stock company unusually entitled the Military-industrial Exchange. Its organizers are the Russian commodity and raw material exchange and the Institute for Machinebuilding, a leading space equipment company. The Flight Control Center rooms, its computer center, and its numerous communications which are now standing idle will be used to conduct business deals. That is the best type of conversion, according to Viktor Surikov, doctor of technical sciences, who is one of the creators of the exchange. True, only enterprises which have so-called special departments [pervyy otdel].

After all, there will be dealings in commodities and equipment some of which are still classified. However generally, anyone, including foreigners, has the right to send an order to the exchange.

Estonia

Ruutel Urges Non-Recognition of Baltic Annexation

LD0607124691 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network
in Estonian 1200 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Interview with Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council, by correspondent Harri Tiido in Tallinn on 5 July—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Tiido] And so, this morning an international conference opened on the subject of East-West economic relations, in the Blue Pavilion at Piritä Exhibitions Square [in Tallinn]. As of lunchtime, there were about 240 participants, with about 10 countries represented. Of the better-known participants, one should mention Zbigniew Brzezinski, former security adviser at the White House; he spoke before lunch on geopolitical subjects, focusing on Europe and the development and future of the Old World. The opening speaker at the conference, Arnold Ruutel, provided his own brief summary of the Baltic states' endeavors, their historical and juridical background, and the attitudes to those both from the West and the East. During the lunch break I asked Mr. Ruutel over to the microphone to clarify some thoughts generated by what I had heard.

It is still ringing in my ears: You saying that the states which have as yet not declared their non-recognition policy with respect to the annexation of the Baltic states and their forced incorporation, should do so now. Who do you have in mind?

[Ruutel] That was a request, and I think that I simply had in mind the fact that—I mean—if, for example, the United States has repeatedly declared this—whether when they meet our politicians, and that at the level of different leading politicians or the president—or in that it has been repeatedly voiced by the top U.S. legislative body at its sessions—then many countries have indeed not done so. Naturally, this is also understandable, because having measured up their political relationships with the USSR they have evidently avoided this.

This address on my part at this forum is perhaps a kind of a sign to the effect that the political situation has reached a stage where everybody should be saying out this word more boldly—I would like to emphasize these last two words—because I believe that there are probably few peoples, with their top authorities of power, who would understand it differently; this has only been done so because of certain deliberations. As I said in my speech today, Western superpowers, the leading powers, have very cautiously talked about all political problems and situations, and about relations with the USSR, evidently feeling a concern that they may complicate the political situation in the USSR inasmuch as this is a matter of major importance for Europe, and one could even say for the whole world. But this does not mean that they do not think like we do. [passage omitted]

[Tiido] The first reports have demonstrated that in name the conference is an East-West economic conference, but that politics is very strongly in the forefront. Can one view this as a confirmation that in our present situation the economy also needs political decisions?

[Ruutel] Well, I would even put it like this: Whenever we talk about the economy, then in essence at present this amounts to politics. This was perhaps best reflected in today's reports: It is impossible to implement economic processes without providing a realistic evaluation of the political situation. At the same time we strive for—through transforming our economy and leading it to a new situation, with a new Europe being shaped—an implementation of political processes first and foremost; as Mr. Brzezinski said, it is not feasible without linking up these two processes, not possible to democratize society as a whole. I would like to add the thought that once we speak of a new security system in Europe, than all this is exactly in the same way linked to the economy and politics.

By the way, about a week ago when I met Gorbachev and talked about the possible union, I said as a last thought of mine that I would like him to take into account one thing: one can talk about the Union in real terms only on those conditions; that is, when he gave Europe to me as an example, I spoke about what could indeed constitute a European integration. It is not the destruction of any one principle; instead it is true preservation of all the principles which have developed throughout the history of human society, and their integration at the same time. This constitutes development. Well, if the Soviet Union manages to understand this, and Moscow and the present leadership first and foremost, then an integration may become plausible, legalized as whichever word or term given to name the Union. But I said that as for the Baltic states—and I am speaking on behalf of Estonia—our experience based on historical memory is grim to such an extent that we would have to legalize our full state independence in an absolute and unambiguous way, and only then we would be able to enter into new agreements, both in the economy as well as in the political sphere, in order to integrate as well—and both toward the West and the East.

Special Police Unit Created To Protect Borders

OW0807042091 Moscow BALTIFAX in English
1530 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A special police armed unit will be created in Estonia to protect borders. The decision was made after Prime Minister of Estonia Edgar Savisaar had visited the major border post Ikla on the Estonian-Latvian border Thursday.

As General Director of the Estonian Border Protection Department Andres Oovel told BF [BALTIFAX], the

Unit's personnel will be recruited in August and begin to operate October 1 this year after taking a special training course.

The new unit will be subordinated to the Police Department only and cooperate with the Border Protection Department.

The newspaper "Paevaleht" reports that until October 1 border guards will adhere to "passive defense" tactics. After October 1 there will be new tactics. The newspaper quotes E. Savisaar as saying that "sooner or later we will fight OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment]".

Latvia

Talks With USSR Remain Unscheduled

*OW0807044991 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1230 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On the instructions of the head of the Soviet delegation for consultations between the USSR and Latvia V. Velichko, a member of the Soviet delegation V. Ogarok informed the permanent representative of the Latvian government in Moscow J. Peters today about the Soviet side's request not to set an exact date for resuming talks. V. Ogarok said that the request is caused by the necessity to scrutinize the June 12 declaration by the Baltic Council and to hold consultations between leaders of the Soviet delegation for talks with the Baltics.

He also emphasized that the Soviet side does not rule out the possibility of holding a meeting between Soviet and Latvian delegations already in July.

Government 'in Solidarity With' Slovenia

*LD0707142491 Riga Radio Riga Network in Russian
0800 GMT 6 Jul 91*

[Text] Latvia is in solidarity with Slovenia. Testimony of this is the telegram adopted on Friday by the Supreme Council to the president of Slovenia, greeting Slovenia in connection with its proclamation of independence. This is an affirmation that Latvia is against the brutal use of force, and regards with approval the constructive reaction from Western democrats that followed the dramatic events in Slovenia. Talks for the transformation of Yugoslavia into a union of sovereign republics would be a step toward a solution of the crisis.

Deputies To Protect 'Security,' 'Independence'

*PM0507145591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 5 Jul 91 First Edition p 1*

["Direct Line" report by Correspondent Colonel M. Ziyemsh: "'Sovereign' Security Only an Excuse"]

[Text] Riga—Some Latvian parliamentary deputies have clearly decided to give up their summer vacation for the

sake of "future independence." This is particularly obvious from the activeness they are currently displaying in safeguarding their security.

For instance, a center for nonviolent resistance led by Deputy O. Kostanda has been set up in the Supreme Soviet building. Steps have been taken to increase the guard on important installations and militia subunits have been put on heightened alert. Well then, but "in the event of an escalation in armed violence the Supreme Soviet is prepared to call the people to defend installations and bear witness to what is happening."

A by no means harmless question arises here: Who intends to commit this armed violence. Regrettably, none of the republic's leaders are able to give a concrete answer.

Maybe there are quite different aims behind the fueling of the current campaign of tension? It is necessary, for instance, somehow to explain to the people why the public security department is working so intensively to set up a border guard service, and why the question of arming special MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] battalions and the future police force is suddenly placed virtually at the center of all sociopolitical life in the republic. And why does parliament plan to adopt its own customs code immediately after this summer vacation?

Deadline Passes for Land Use Requests

*LD0507085891 Riga Radio Riga International
in Latvian 0430 GMT 23 Jun 91*

[Summary] On 20 June the scheduled time laid down by legislators by which inhabitants had to submit requests for the restoration of the rights for using land and also requests for farming land anew ended. Especially during recent days, the number of people requesting land grew rapidly. Whereas by 15 April only 26,000 requests had been submitted for peasant farms, with a total land area of 365,000 hectares, by the end of May there were already more than 40,000 requests with nearly 900,000 hectares. It is envisaged to begin to develop approximately 300,000 hectares only in 1996, the final scheduled time in the land reform.

A full future picture of the users of land will become clear in the beginning of July, when the rural district land commissions will reply to the requests. In the meantime, these commissions report that the number of requests considerably exceeds the area of land to be allocated. At the same time a larger number of those requesting land, having the rights to the land, do not intend to farm it, but hope to lease it or sell it; according to the land commissions approximately 35 percent of the applications are of this kind.

Lithuania

Draft Economic Treaty Sent to Moscow

PM0507201091 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Nikolay Lashkevich from Vilnius: "Lithuanian Sets Subsistence Level"]

[Text] The present official subsistence level in Lithuania is set by the government at 255 rubles [R] per person per month.

On 1 January 1991 the level was R129, that is, little more than half the present "poverty line." From now on the subsistence level will be index-linked, and will probably soon rise even higher because of the forthcoming price rises. The government is to submit a draft new price-indexation procedure by 10 September.

These measures could be seen as yet another attempt by the Lithuanian leadership to stabilize the republic's economic life. Lithuania realizes that it cannot overcome the economic crisis in isolation; joint efforts are needed. This is indicated, in particular, by a telegram from Prime Minister G. Vagnorius to USSR President M. Gorbachev, Prime Minister V. Pavlov, and Vice Premier V. Doguzhiyev. In the telegram the Lithuanian head of government notes that the settlement of relations between Lithuania and the USSR will be promoted by the signing of a bilateral treaty on trade and economic cooperation, a draft of which has already been sent to Moscow.

Incidentally, from 1 July G. Vagnorius has renounced his wages as a deputy, paying them into the Lithuanian Health and Charity Fund.

Statement on Role of Police Noted

LD0707005491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has published a statement addressed to the people of Lithuania and the Lithuanian police force.

It is noted that, in defending the rights of a state and its people and their economic and political freedoms, an important role is assigned to law and order institutions—especially to its restored police force. Its goal is to protect the interests of the Lithuanian Republic and those of its people, without regard for their political, ideological, religious, or other beliefs.

By its actions, the police must demonstrate that their motto is: All are equal before the law.

In expressing its trust it accords to the police force, the state grants it far-reaching powers and support, in accordance with [word indistinct], it will be provided with everything needed for its activities.

The state is of the opinion that individuals serving in the police force, will carry out their duties in a proper and exemplary fashion, the government statement notes.

Vagnorius Discusses Economic Reform

LD0607101591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Text] The Lithuanian economic reform has already started and is in full swing. This was stated yesterday by Prime Minister Vagnorius in his television speech. In recent weeks, this was not the first prime minister's television speech. His frequent public appearances indicate an open government policy that inspired a lot of confidence in the present government. The aim of this open dialogue is evident enough. The essence of the reform now under way in Lithuania must be explained to the public at large, why and how the life of people will change, why the government is making such decisions, and the government also wishes to know the opinion of the people and how far they support the government policy.

The government plans to increase wages and social payouts to the population for the second time this year. At the same time, the price of food products and of some other essential consumer goods will increase. During this or next month, a new order of trading in goods which are in great demand will be introduced. All this increases tension in society. Most of the people are waiting for the price rise with great anxiety.

Gediminas Vagnorius explained yesterday in his television speech that there should be no reason for concern. The Lithuanian Government will not introduce the price rise until it is quite sure that the majority supports this necessary step. Asked by the television viewers how the government would know about such support by the population, the prime minister replied that the government has the means to find out. One of them he mentioned includes the government special telephone on which people may state their views on any issue which concerns them. According to Gediminas Vagnorius, the government price policy is supported by the majority in Lithuania, although there are those who are undecided and those who disagree. It would seem that the time has come to take a decisive step and increase prices, but the prime minister could not say when this time would come and when the prices would be increased.

By the way, he added that this should have been done a few months ago but that the government had to bear in mind the generally negative mood of the people. On the other hand, the government was not ready yet to pay out monetary compensations necessary to cover the differences in prices. According to the prime minister, the people should not worry over the forthcoming price rise since they will receive compensations larger than the actual price increase. For instance, the average person will spend only 30 rubles per month on food, while the increase in his monthly pay will amount to approximately 150 rubles. From July on, every industrial worker

will earn twice as much and in some industrial fields even up to four or five times as much.

Gediminas Vagnorius said that regulating wages is the cornerstone of economic reform. The second important feature of the economic reform is a modern compensation system that allows for providing social security to the poorest part of society. The government pays the greatest attention to the family and the child; from now on, every child will get at least a 70-ruble monthly payout until he or she reaches the age of 16 or the age of 18 in case he or she is a high school student. Orphans and disabled children will receive even bigger monetary compensations. According to Gediminas Vagnorius, all state enterprises are already ready to function in free market conditions. This means that the enterprises are much more free to manage their own financial resources. The new principles of forming the state budget and the hard currency fund and the imminent privatization process also point to the economic reform that is now under way in Lithuania. Gediminas Vagnorius noted that in the first half of July the first packet of enterprises to be privatized will be made public, and the first auctions will begin.

Lithuania has left behind its neighbors in the reforming of its economy. It is very important for us, said Vagnorius, that not only Latvia and Estonia but also Russia are making use of our economic experience. This should help to develop our economic relations with Russia. On the other hand, Lithuania does not yet control its borders; therefore, it is essential to protect its domestic market. One of the measures to do this is the increase of prices and wages here, in Lithuania. This should stop the process of taking the goods out of Lithuania. It has been calculated that, along with various food items, 500,000 rubles are taken out of Lithuania, and this makes up for 25 percent of state subsidies for agricultural produce. Gediminas Vagnorius stressed the great importance of protecting the food market now that the Soviet Union is facing the ever hungry autumn and winter.

The Lithuanian Government is also taking measures to protect the market of other goods in Lithuania. These measures are temporary but necessary for the present stage of economic reform. Gediminas Vagnorius believes that the Lithuanian shop counters will display a greater variety of goods in the last six months of this year. The government has defined the state tasks for the enterprises which oblige them to sell a certain part of goods here, in Lithuania. Such tasks have been defined also for the first half of the year, but they have not been perfect. Thus, the government does not regulate what quantity of products the enterprise must turn out, and freedoms of producers are not violated. On the other hand, the producers themselves regard this step by the government with criticism and think that this violates their rights. Gediminas Vagnorius remains consistent by stating that the interests of people have priority. Of course, not everyone agrees that this happens in real life,

but the government's main principle remains as follows: If additional difficulties can be avoided, they must be avoided.

Vagnorius Cables Gorbachev on OMON Actions

*LD0707081991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Text] Republic of Lithuania Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius has sent a telegram addressed to the President of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev.

It notes: The Government of the Republic of Lithuania favorably assesses your directive [words indistinct] to investigate the incident in which the Ministry of Internal Affairs OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] seized the telegraph and telephone center in Vilnius for several hours.

The facts of this willful OMON-perpetrated action require immediate response. Regrettably, the government of the Republic of Lithuania is compelled to inform you that the leadership of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry has assumed a waiting position, thus, there remains a danger that such crimes may be repeated in the future. [passage indistinct]

One of the deputies of the USSR minister of internal affairs paid a visit to Vilnius at the beginning of July; however, he refused to meet with Lithuanian Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs and government representatives.

The representatives of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs should not avoid such cooperation, but should, on the contrary, strive to make it more active.

The support rendered to the terrorist OMON group, by the most conservative political circles of the Soviet Union and [words indistinct] serve to discredit the efforts of the USSR leadership to implement economic and political reforms [words indistinct] the faith of the Lithuanian Republic's citizens in the sincerity of the declarations of the Soviet leadership, regarding its desire to terminate more quickly, by legal means, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs terrorist [word indistinct] within the territory of the Lithuanian Republic.

OMON Said Supported by Conservatives

*OW0807034691 Moscow BALTFA in English
1000 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The government of Lithuania has warned President Gorbachev that "OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] terror has been supported by the the USSR's most conservative political groups."

The Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius's message to the Soviet leader accuses the leadership of the

USSR Interior Ministry of showing a wait-and-see attitude to the acts of arbitrariness perpetrated by OMON during the past 6 months. Mr. Vagnorius views the right-wing backing of OMON as a factor "discrediting the USSR leadership's efforts to see through economic and political reforms."

Unit Facing Disbandment

LD0607213891 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 1350 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Report by Oleg Kirchok, YEVROPAFORUM Agency correspondent in Vilnius]

[Text] After (Bolislav Makutonovich), commander of the Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON], arrived in Moscow where, according to TASS, he was severely reprimanded by Boris Pugo himself, for the clearly provocative seizure of the Lithuanian republican inter-city telephone exchange, certain changes also took place in the commands of the two divisions stationed in Vilnius.

The notorious General (Sobchik) was retired. It was he who provided tanks for the January assaults in Lithuania. And General Zhitnikov, commander of a division of the USSR Ministry of the Interior, was moved to Kharkov to the comfortable post of head of a college. It is his subordinates who still defend the seized Television Center, the television tower, and the Press House. By the way, Captain (Makutonovich) was previously formally subordinate to the same Zhitnikov.

Although all of these changes have been justified by completely plausible reasons, it is quite clear that both generals have fallen out of favor with the president. And (Makutonovich)'s unit, as has become known from unofficial sources, is threatened with being disarmed and disbanded which has greatly alarmed local communist leaders.

A typical campaign has been set in motion to collect signatures in support of the unfortunate OMON victims of Gorbachev's wrath. As ever, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania organized the spontaneous event and concealed itself behind meaningless and completely neutral names of organizations: the Civic Committee, the Congress of Democratic Forces, the Council of Veterans. Leaflets have been distributed to enterprises under Union subordination.

Of course, no one controls anything and one can say with complete confidence that there will be few signatures. In any event, in the Vilnius city party committee where the campaign's coordinating center is evidently located there are very few who wish to support the armed cut-throats. By the way, communists are not unused to deceit nor to the writers' art. If anything needs to be written, they will write it. Because they are losing the most effective destabilizing force. One can even say that they are losing their last support. Now one can only guess how OMON itself will react to being disarmed. Recent events very

clearly show that OMON acts contrary to President Gorbachev. Further, it is conducting a war against him.

Paper Views Vilnius Garrison Chief's Transfer

PM0507160791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jul 91 p 1

[A. Korzun report: "New Military Reshuffles in Lithuania"]

[Text] There is maybe no other republic where so much attention is being paid to the Soviet Army as is the case in Lithuania. Even its slightest move does not escape the field of vision of politicians and journalists. And not just on the streets of Vilnius but also in the garrison hierarchy. And this time it is precisely the cadre question in the army structure that is being discussed in Lithuania.

As Colonel Grigoriy Belous, commandant of the Vilnius Garrison told us, last week there was a change in the military command of the garrison. Its former chief, Major General Vladimir Uskhopchik, whose name became known throughout the world after his direct participation in the January events in Vilnius, has been reassigned.

According to Major General Viktor Vakar, chief of the Baltic Military District Military-Political Directorate, the decision on Uskhopchik's transfer came as a surprise to many people.

"This year he was to have entered the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Academy," Vakar said, "but he recently asked the command to be transferred to new duties. His reason for this request was a desire to be nearer his parents, whose health is deteriorating. He is now serving in Brest."

In analyzing the transfer of a military chief from a republic where his name is recalled by the majority of the population with feelings that are by no means the best for Uskhopchik, you could entertain the thought that the Ministry of Defense has "responded" to the constant criticism of the actions of its subordinates in the Baltic states. However, Vakar said: "I cannot connect the Vilnius events with Uskhopchik's transfer to Brest. Particularly since the command and the party organization have had no complaints against him this year."

Belous says the same thing: "I can only describe Uskhopchik, and indeed Colonel Aleksandr Garkush, his former deputy, now acting chief of the Vilnius Garrison, in positive terms."

In general, all the commanders are people who are positive in every respect. They do not keep any others...

Groups Protest Law on Dismissing Officials

LD0507091491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Information about the plenary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council: Today's sitting was mainly devoted to the examination of the draft agricultural reform law. Today the session also adopted an appeal of the Supreme Council to the states-signatories of the Paris Charter. Regulations of the town councils were approved.

A proposal was made to pass a law on the dismissal of local government officials before the expiration of the period of their service. As you know, this law has been examined several times already. But the leftist, center, and liberal factions protested against the adoption of this law stating that the law did not correspond with the basic law. The faction members left the hall in protest. Three parliamentary factions—the nationalist, the seventh, and the Sajudis—responded to this demarche with a statement. It was ready by Deputy virgilijus Cepaitis.

[Begin recording] A joint statement by the Sajudis, the Tautininkai, and the seventh factions. The people of Lithuania are aware of the difficult situation in our towns and in our countryside, where state property is being plundered without any control, and of how difficult it is to introduce order in trade and the communal economy, enterprises, and collective farms. In many towns and villages the officials are used to working according to the old methods, and are sabotaging the laws passed by the Supreme Council and the regulations passed by the government to introduce radical reforms in Lithuania, and which would result in the introduction of elementary order. This is especially important as privatization is approaching.

On 4 July, the Supreme Council had to vote on the law enabling the government to remove from their posts local government officials who do not observe the laws, abuse their duties, and hamper the reform. However, the leftist faction at the Supreme Council representing the Lithuanian Democratic Labor party opposed the adoption of such a law, stating that it would not take part in the voting. It was supported in official statements by the Center and Liberal factions.

The deputies of these and of the Polish faction left the hall, wrecking the quorum and thus preventing the adoption of the law.

The joint Sajudis, Tautininkai, and the seventh factions resolutely protest against the attempts to preserve the old nomenclature, hamper the work of the Supreme Council, and state that they will do everything in order that this problem, important to all Lithuania, is solved. [end recording]

Later a statement was made on the same issue by the Liberal faction. It is read by deputy Jonas Tamulis.

[Begin recording] A statement by the Liberal faction of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania:

On 4 July this year, during the voting on the draft law enabling the government to remove elected local government officials from their posts, the Liberal faction expressed its protest and left the hall. The faction previously gave an official warning to those preparing the draft that it would take this step, clearly stating its motives. The authors of the draft failed to pay attention to serious and motivated remarks.

The Liberal faction did not take part in the voting because the draft law contradicts the provisional basic law of the Republic of Lithuania, its 96th, 120th paragraphs. In creating the law-abiding and democratic state, everyone must respect the laws and strictly observe them. Above all, this applies to the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. Meanwhile, problems concerning local governments can and must be solved without violating the Constitution. This is the matter for the Procuracy and the courts. Above all, care must be taken of the effective functioning of the legal system, and not to deal with it with the aid of voluntarist administrative solutions, which have been so characteristic of the Soviet socialist system. It is not possible to declare one thing and do something else.

Since the Supreme Council is concluding the examination of some other draft laws which violate the provisional basic law, too, the faction states that it will do everything in order that the Constitution is observed. [end recording]

'Day of State' Holiday Observed for First Time

LD0707040191 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT
6 Jul 91

[Text] Vilnius July 6 ELTA-TASS—Lithuania today flies its national flags on the occasion of a notable event.

Lithuania's day of state is being observed for the first time in the republic although it commemorates an event that took place more than 700 years ago.

In 1252, the Lithuanian state was put on the map of Europe, after Mindaugas was crowned king and his possessions proclaimed Lithuanian kingdom.

The coronation of Mindaugas is being commemorated for the first time across Lithuania this year upon the initiative of a group of enthusiasts who last year came up with the idea to mark the anniversary of that major 13th century event in the history of the Lithuanian people as its national holiday. The Lithuanian parliament presidium responded to the initiative by passing a resolution establishing "day of state" as a national holiday.

Lithuanian Party Proposes Stability Measures

OW0807042791 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1230 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A meeting of the Lithuanian Democratic Party of Labour [LDPL] (one of the leading opposition forces in the republic, Chairman—Arvidas Brazauskas) on July 6 adopted the document "Position of the LDPL on strengthening the statehood of Lithuania."

The document says that in order to stabilize political and economic situation in Lithuania it is necessary "to

declare an act of national reconciliation, to stop political discrimination and deideologize state institutions."

The LDPL also proposes to organize "a round table" involving all political forces to discuss all existing problems and work out compromised solutions and programs.

The document points out that while establishing interstate relations with the USSR Lithuania should realize that it is not only of economic but also of defense interest to the USSR. Talks with the USSR should be aimed at reaching agreements which would make it possible to carry out economic reforms in Lithuania.

Polozkov Telephones TASS To Deny Resignation

LD0507121891 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT
5 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—Russian Communist Party leader Ivan Polozkov denied rumours about his resignation today, promising to stay on in order to "unite forces in the interest of perestroika, society and the party".

Ivan Polozkov phoned TASS today and said he did not submit a letter of resignation.

The situation in the Russian Communist Party is complex, he said, admitting that the trends in the party were as diversified as "a rainbow" and that some members were dissatisfied with him and the Central Committee.

"I will resign when I see that I cannot resolve this task (uniting society)," Polozkov said.

He said he was in "normal" mood before the forthcoming Russian party plenum and did not intend to deliver an account at the plenum. The forum will discuss strategic and tactical targets, he said. "There is no reason to make us accountable," he said.

He denied reports that several Siberian party leaders were demanding his resignation.

"Not a single party committee at republican or regional level took a decision on the need to reelect the first secretary," he said.

Silayev Statement on Clash With USSR Cabinet

PM0407211691 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 1

["Own information" report: "I. Silayev's Press Statement"]

[Text] RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Prime Minister I. Silayev met with representatives of the mass media yesterday.

After my speech at the Supreme Soviet session 28 June, he said, PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published a commentary, distributed by TASS, by Yu. Mikhaylov, leader of the Union premier's press service, and A. Dubinyak, deputy chief of the economic department of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers apparatus, the content of which I categorically disagree with. The authors took it upon themselves to venture, in the name of the Union Government, to accuse the Russian leadership of trying to shift their own difficulties onto its shoulders. This, they stated, is contrary to the Nine plus One document and the program for extricating the economy from the crisis.

In fact it is not like that at all, I. Silayev stressed. Certainly, the economy is in crisis. But the republic cannot be seen in isolation from the Union. To put it in concrete terms, its indicators are in many respects better than for the country as a whole. Thus the volume of

output, operations, and services in industry in January-May, for the USSR as a whole, fell by 5.6 percent compared with the same period last year, while in the RSFSR it fell by 2.9 percent. And the same is true for the majority of indicators. Knowing these figures, how is it possible to interpret the Russian premier's speech solely in terms of the desire to justify hitches in the RSFSR national economy?

The Cabinet of Ministers and the Union republics' governments worked on the joint action program for a long time. But the cabinet resolution of 15 June negated the accords reached. Although Russia, like the other republics, actively protested against the adoption of this document. Back on 4 June First Deputy Premier O. Lobov sent the cabinet a 12-point commentary, but not one of these points was taken into account. "So who is destroying the 'fragile but promising consensus' between the participants in the future renewed Union?" the premier asked rhetorically.

I. Silayev again noted that the cabinet resolution in effect leaves the economy of the republics and the country's national economy defenseless in the face of administrative tyranny. Their rights are again being usurped by the center. This applies to the distribution of the state order, currency policy, the banking system.... And the introduction of a federal tax in the form proposed by the center will simply ruin the Russian economy. That, the Russian premier stated, is why we cannot agree with the Cabinet of Ministers resolution.

I remain an ardent supporter of the Nine plus One agreement, Ivan Stepanovich said in conclusion, and I am prepared to cooperate in that spirit.

Pay Concession Halts Leningrad Dock Strike

PM0507225991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 1

[O. Rogozin report: "From V. Pavlov Correspondence With Load Handlers"]

[Text] The Leningrad sea port strike committee is disbanding without waiting for the appointed strike date—8 July. Dockers in most of the country's ports were intending to support the Leningrad port workers' strike in one form or another.

On this occasion, however, Prime Minister V. Pavlov gave in to the strike committee's demands. The Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a resolution under which the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet is empowered to allow maritime transport enterprises to increase the proportion of their funds earmarked for consumption to 40 percent.

This decision will make it possible to increase port workers' wages by half, on average.

5 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

LD0607110191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1930 GMT on 5 July broadcasts the "At the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet" program of recorded highlights of proceedings at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 5 July.

Ruslan Khasbulatov, who is chairing the session, speaks about the need for a special report on the Union treaty, which is being held up by "negative processes." World public opinion is worried about the fate of the USSR in the face of political instability. Gorbachev is praised for his understanding of Russia's problems.

At 1936 GMT Deputy Shakhrai speaks. He asks questions about the Union treaty, which Khasbulatov answers, giving details of how the discussion of it is going in the republics. The Ukraine is willing to sort out all the problems with the USSR president, notes Khasbulatov.

At 1939 GMT Boris Yeltsin speaks on the Union treaty and the republics' attitudes to it. He notes there are alternative taxation systems: only the RSFSR and the Ukraine favor a one-channel system.

At 1940 GMT Deputy Ponomarev continues the discussion of the Union treaty, criticizing "ultra-conservatives" and "narrowly bureaucratic structures." He warns that the RSFSR could disintegrate, and points out the disadvantages of a two-channel tax system. The republics' rights are in jeopardy, he says—the treaty should not be emasculated.

At 1944 GMT Sergey Nikolayevich Baburin asks: What are the aims of the Union treaty? He is skeptical of "pious hopes and beautiful dreams." Will the treaty solve the real problems? We seem to have unconsciously renounced the Union, he says—yet years of history cannot be banished from the memory. If we want another 1917, then we need a clean break from the past; but reason is on the side of constitutional reform, not revolution. The republics, says Baburin, must pull together, or the center will be helpless. The treaty would be a step toward normalizing Soviet society, but cannot replace the Constitution of the USSR, he says. The treaty should be signed and then submitted to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies for ratification.

At 1952 GMT a delegate appeals for brevity and concreteness.

At 1953 GMT Shakhrai speaks again. The Union treaty is the focus of a political struggle, he says—this draft would mean the collapse of the RSFSR, and therefore of the Union. He objects to particular articles. Reforms and citizenship are in danger, he says, and suggest a distribution of powers among republics and the Union.

At 2002 GMT the program is interrupted by the 17-minute "Vesti" news program. At 2019 GMT the "At the

RSFSR Supreme Soviet" program resumes. Deputy Medvedev says we must make up our minds what the Russian state is. Without clarity on this, we will not achieve a Union treaty, he says. The main problem is that some republics want to stay in the RSFSR, other want out, and so on. Everything else is secondary. The Union Government should have no special powers, says Medvedev.

At 2020 GMT Deputy Verenchuk talks about matters that should be under Union control, or joint control. Legislation must be clearly demarcated, he says—otherwise nothing will be achieved, and Russian sovereignty could evaporate.

At 2021 GMT Yeltsin reviews the discussions of the Union treaty to date. There have been long debates and arguments over every word, he says. The main dispute has been over the former autonomous republics. On this, a compromise has been found. Some provisions of the draft treaty have been given insufficient attention, he says. Disagreements remain, but can be sorted out by the Supreme Soviet if fundamentals are accepted. Yeltsin says: We will get nowhere if we are stuck with a dozen versions of the treaty. He urges a one-channel tax system, and appeals for common sense. Every day we are suffering from the lack of a Union treaty, he says. He notes that the Supreme Soviet recess will last until 15 September.

At 2031 GMT Khasbulatov says a decision must be taken today. Self-government is to be debated next, he says. The announcer then notes that while the commission met to deal with the Union treaty issue, amendments to the law on local self-government were debated by deputies.

At 2033 GMT an unidentified deputy reads out the text of the proposed resolution on the Union treaty.

At 2034 GMT another deputy says that the latest draft is an improvement. It is put to the vote, and passed.

Yeltsin Comments on Union Treaty

CM0807120791 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2021 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Speech by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin at RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 5 July—recorded from the "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet" program]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies. I perceive today such a white heat, and such a variety of views. That is understandable, as the issue we are examining is very serious. I do not agree with those who say we are examining this issue too late. Let us recall the Congress of People's Deputies. Let us recall the two sessions of the Supreme Soviet, which examined the question of the Union treaty. It has been under discussion for a long

time—for many months. Moreover, it has been discussed by representatives, a working group, of absolutely all the republics, and of the Union, for about two months. Furthermore, it was examined by the committee set up by the Union Congress of People's Deputies to prepare the draft Union treaty—which is comprised of the president of the country, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Union, the presidents and chairmen of all the Union... [changes thought] the supreme soviets of all the Union republics, as well as of the republics that form part of those republics, those that have sovereignty. In other words, this document was examined not on the Nine plus One formula, but jointly with our former autonomous republics and their leaders. I also have to say that, well, the debate lasted eight, nine, or ten hours, and there was a wrangle over literally every word.

On the whole, the watershed did not lie between the center, as we are used to saying—representatives of Gorbachev and Lukyanov were there, so to speak—but on the whole, it was between the representatives of the Union republics and those of the former autonomous republics. That is to say, of the republics which form part of republics. That is where the main dispute was. Therefore, all that has been said here today, I would say is a compromise which has been reached between the representatives of the current Union republics and yesterday's autonomous republics. A compromise that has been found. Many of you do not seem to have read very carefully all of the draft submitted on behalf of the preparatory committee, which worked—I say it again—pretty thoroughly on that document.

Look at Article I as an example. You did not pay any attention to the second paragraph: relations between states, one of which lies within the other, are to be regulated by the treaties between them, and by the Constitution of the state in which it lies. So, we have spent about five hours on Constitution or Constitutions, all because of two letters, because a principle really does lie within this. Either according to the Constitutions of all the republics, including those that form part of the Russian Republic, or according to the Constitutions of Russia and of the other republics that are today Union republics. So that is what is meant in this case, the Constitution of Russia—it is what determines the relations of all the republics forming part of the Russian Federation. I am not going to speak of the other remarks, which would indeed perhaps be difficult to summarize here, but have actually been very well thought out and could of course be adopted today in principle. Yes, at the last of these sessions and examinations the suggestion was made that we do it like this. We have still not reached agreement on everything. Some disagreements still remain. We do not agree, say, with the center on a number of fundamental issues—those that are set out in the draft resolution which you have. So let us send this draft in its present form to the supreme soviets, so that the supreme soviets can examine this draft and save us time. This is an act of enormous political importance,

and today, everyone is looking at Russia: What, after all, what will it say? To simply reject it, this can only mean political failure, and the destabilization of the whole political situation in the country, or suppose common sense prevails, and signing is agreed, or some other formula is found as a basis like the three proposals which were expressed here, and at one and the same time without fundamental criticisms, the Union treaty should not be signed.

But, on the other hand, think of the fact that we cannot dictate the process of this treaty, we cannot say that without this we will not sign. Then there would be nine Union treaties, nine versions of treaties and everyone would insist on what they want, then we would never reach a compromise. Therefore, we sought some sort of compromise, the sort of compromise which would, however, not affect Russia's sovereignty.

For example—please don't interrupt me—with regard to taxation. This is one of the most fundamental issues, one of the most fundamental. The center does not want to give it to the republics. They do, however, want to restrict it to one channel, keep it for themselves, for the Union departments. Our proposal is for a one-stream system, since we adopted a law on taxation, and this system for a fixed sum is envisaged in this, and, correspondingly this year, we are already working according to this system. To change it, we need to change our own law, that is, we need to vote by a two-thirds majority to change the law. I have had many conversations with Gorbachev on this, some of them one-on-one. I told him that I cannot agree to compromises here without the Supreme Soviet, as we have the law. So what the Supreme Soviet decides—there is an obligation—decides in its own way, that is the will of the soviet, so it can impose an obligation to sign the treaty.

Further, all the same, I would like to call upon you, respected people's deputies, in this situation, to show common sense. Think about the state in which the country and Russia now find themselves. Now, every day we are losing out because there is no Union treaty. Without that treaty there is not even a minimal demarcation of functions, or joint functioning as is laid down in this draft law. Every day, this weighs down upon us. Here we do have a good basis to go on and work on a new constitution for the USSR.

Yes, there are comments. Let us in the resolution take all the comments embodied in the draft resolution. If they are not enough, let us enlarge them and say that with the signing of the treaty we will take these comments into account without fail. You say let us go back again to the Supreme Soviet. But you forget that the Supreme Soviet is going into recess, and will convene again on 15 September. So until 15 September no work of any kind will be done. So if more comments are to be taken into account than those included in the draft resolution, then perhaps we might adopt a compromise version, taking these comments into account, in some group—shall we say in the course of today, Saturday, and Sunday, and on

Monday hold another sitting of the Supreme Soviet, specifically on the Union treaty—specifically on the Union treaty—taking into account all these comments. And then come back to passing the resolution on the Union treaty. And that is what I urge you to do. Thank you.

Draft Union Treaty Approved

LD0507182391 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT
05 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS— The Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet today approved, with some reservations, the draft treaty of Union submitted by national President Mikhail Gorbachev on June 18, 1991.

The republican parliament also formed a state delegation, to be led by the Russian president, to put finishing touches to the treaty and sign it.

The debate on the issue went on for the entire day and was very keen. A large number of deputies proposed putting off the draft until later, saying it was only half-baked.

President-elect Boris Yeltsin told the session that rejecting the treaty now would mean dooming the country to destabilisation and collapse.

Under the parliamentary resolution, Russia will act in treaty process "jointly with the republics of the Russian Federation as a joint subject." Several former autonomous entities within the Russian Federation proclaimed themselves sovereign republics. One of them, Tatarstan, declared its intention to sign the Union treaty on its own.

The resolution envisages that the Russian Federation's jurisdiction covers all businesses situated on its territory, including defense enterprises.

One of the main questions yet to be settled is the clause regulating taxes. Russia and the Ukraine insist on a single-tier system of taxation.

The Russian parliament reserved the right to review the final version of the Union treaty.

6 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

LD0707011991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television network in Russian at 2015 GMT on 6 July carries the 30-minute "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet" session program on proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 6 July.

Khasbulatov opens the session. The debate on the draft law on local self-government in the RSFSR continues. Igor Lazarev, RSFSR Minister of Finance, speaks from the floor about the preparation of local budgets. He

supports proposals made this morning and criticizes provisions for budget revenues. He complains about inconsistencies in the bill.

Next, Kuznetsov from Volgograd responds to Lazarev's statement. He disagrees that the budget system is being demolished. He talks about the 13 percent profits tax. This will be distributed among the soviets. The bill is voted on in principle and is passed by 153 against three.

Mityukov, deputy chairman of the Constitutional Commission, then talks about the election of judges to the RSFSR Constitutional Court. Speaking from the podium, he says that the Supreme Soviet's Committees on Legislation, Human Rights, and Law and Order have been discussing 38 candidates for membership of the constitutional court. The provisions of the RSFSR Constitution were followed. These set age limits and insist on qualifications and experience of at least 10 years. The voting was conducted in secret; 33 members of the committees took part in the voting. The list was narrowed down to 21 by this method. There are to be 15 places on the constitutional court. Mityukov reads the names of the candidates. There are representatives of eight regions. Mityukov talks about their qualifications. There are two representatives of autonomous entities in the RSFSR—one from Tuva and the other from Karachayevo-Cherkessia. The candidates are all good men, worthy of selection by the Supreme Soviet, he says, adding that the list could be increased to 23 or 24 if need be.

A deputy asks what procedures were adopted in picking these candidates. Mityukov explains that two candidates ended up with the same number of votes. Only one of them was chosen in the end. All the political groups wanted their own members.

A deputy remarks that 10 of the candidates are Communists, but only one is from Democratic Russia. Mityukov says the wishes of all political groups have been considered. The vote on the bill was passed by 148 against five.

At the evening session housing regulations were considered. Veshnyakov talks about the regulations and the living space that should be allocated to each citizen. A vote is taken on an amendment by Veshnyakov. The vote is 42 against 39. The package of amendments to the housing code is passed by 90 against two, and 77 against four, in separate votes by the chambers.

Zakharov talks about savings and citizens' incomes. He speaks on behalf of a commission. (Rogacheva), deputy from Chukotka, makes a point from the floor. She complains about the drain of people from the North. She says there should be special weighting for the North. Zakharov answers this point. He says that his commission has given special consideration to the North. Deputy (Mananenkov) proposes an amendment, concerning Northern weighting and indexation. He says the rights of Northerners are being scorned.

Deputy Rogacheva speaks from the podium on behalf of fishermen in the Far East. She reads an appeal from the fishermen, who complain about their difficult working conditions. Japanese fishermen are being allowed to threaten the livelihood of local fishermen. No other countries allow this to happen. Nothing has been done about this. The fish stocks of the Bering Strait are being depleted. She asks: Who signed a disadvantageous contract? Why are foreign fishermen being given preferential treatment? Where is the money going? Japanese fishing boats are plundering salmon stocks of Kamchatka.

Next (Lukin) speaks on behalf of the Committee on International Affairs. It is dealing with the problem of the Bering Sea. But no information has been received from the USSR Foreign Ministry on talks with other countries. Better information has been received from the POSTFAKTUM news agency. The fishing problem is a difficult one. I will report in the fall if I get fresh information, he says.

At 2045 GMT Khasbulatov ends the session.

Candidate Judges Nominated

LD0607201291 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT
6 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—The Russian parliament nominated today 21 candidates to the posts of judges of the Russian Constitutional Court.

In accordance with the principle of the division of power into the court, executive and legislative authorities, the Constitutional Court is to exercise control over the compliance of Russian laws with the republican constitution. Under the Russian legislation, the Constitutional Court will be made up of 13 people.

A judge should be no younger than 35 and no older than 65. He should have a professional record of no less than ten years.

As a result of a heated discussion (many parliamentary groups wished to have their representative nominated to the Constitutional Court) Russian legislators decided to add three to four candidates from autonomous republics. It was decided to recommend their nomination to the chairman of the Russian parliament.

The composition of the Constitutional Court will be approved by the Fifth Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, which opens in Moscow on July 10.

Yeltsin on Shevardnadze, Democratic Reform

OW0507080991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Boris Yeltsin has declared that Russia will try to make the economic agreement to be concluded after signing the new Union Treaty "apply to the space of all

the 15 republics, and not only to the 9 signatories of the renewed federation [quotation marks as received].

Replying journalists on Thursday after his meeting with the Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari now on a visit in the Soviet Union, B. Yeltsin mentioned that he'd been discussing "five debatable points" of the Union Treaty with Mikhail Gorbachev.

One of the chief problems, according to the Russian leader, is taxation. B. Yeltsin said that Russia and the Ukraine are for a one-channel system, whereas the rest of the republics and Gorbachev are for a two channel one.

B. Yeltsin noted that discussions on dividing powers between the central government and the republics continue: "We would like to have the maximum, while Gorbachev would cut it down".

He went on to say that "a heated debate" is to be expected in Russia's parliament on Friday on that and on other points of the Union Treaty.

Boris Yeltsin added, "The president will not go to London before he tells our Nine what he is going to do there, and then we'll see".

B. Yeltsin refused to comment on the resignation of Eduard Shevardnadze from the Communist Party saying that "it's his personal business".

To the question about his attitude towards the new "Movement for Democratic Reforms" he replied, "Some of my close associates are there, and that means a lot". He said "it had better be a party" and expressed confidence that it would be so in the near future.

Boris Yeltsin told the journalists that his meeting with the Mexican president had been useful and that "Russia is going to establish direct contacts with Mexico". Carlos Salinas de Gortari invited him to pay an official visit to his country. The date is to be specified in future.

Russian Communist Deputies Urge Leadership Change

LD0607152991 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT
6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Twelve people's deputies—members of the Russian Communist Party, ten of whom are members of the republican parliament, appealed today to the forthcoming plenary meeting of the party Central Committee. They demanded the revision of the strategy and tactics of the Russian Communist Party and the changing of its leadership.

The appeal, circulated today, blames the leaders of the Russian Communist Party for "many ruinous decisions and the actual discrediting of the party."

The authors of the appeal believe that the root cause underlying the present situation is the "political deafness of the party leadership to different opinions."

The appeal points to the "obvious discrepancy between the traditional image of the party and the share of power in the top government structures of the Russian Federation, which really belongs to it." "It is high time the party summons political courage and acts as a constructive opposition," it says.

The deputies demanded the early convocation of a congress of the Russian communist party which, in their opinion, should "change immediately and radically not only the programme, but also the rules and the name of the party."

The deputies believe that the "fact that the party Central Committee keeps silent about the stand, assumed by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is regarded as its complete approval."

"In conditions of massive dissatisfaction of communists with the actions, or rather lack of action, of the Soviet president, this silence can be described only as political suicide or the murder of the party," the appeal says.

"The president who is incapable of ensuring the observance of the constitution, who issues decrees none of which is being implemented, cannot hold the post of the party leader any longer," says the appeal of Russian Communist Deputies.

Yakovlev To Become Moscow City Assembly Chairman

*LD0507132791 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Jul 91*

[Text] A curious fact: KURANTY reported today that Aleksandr Yakovlev, one of the founders of the democratic reform movement and the USSR president's senior adviser, has, without leaving this post, accepted Moscow Mayor Gavril Popov's proposal to become chairman of the city assembly. All the leaders of the Moscow branches of political parties, of the Democratic Russia movement, of trade unions, and also of other major public and artistic organizations will be represented on this consultative body. Thus it will be a radical from the CPSU who will be in charge of this new public institution.

Leningrad TV Staff Leaving '600 Seconds' Program

*LD0707215291 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 2000 GMT 7 Jul 91*

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Leningrad Television is 53 years old today, but a sensational piece of news emerged on the eve of the anniversary. Two of the founders of the "600 Seconds" program—producer Aleksandr Borisoglebskiy and

director Kiril Shishkin—have left the program. Unconfirmed reports say that others leaving the program include presenters Vadim Medvedev and Aleksey Zagradnyuk, and several other correspondents.

Reports from Leningrad indicate that, despite the idyllic picture of relationships within the program team painted by Aleksandr Nevzorov in an interview shown today in the "Authors' Television" program, the main reason for the departure of these leading correspondents from "600 seconds" lies in acute differences—not only creative but political, too—with the head of the program.

Sovetskiy Rayon Demands Recall of Deputy Baburin

*LD0707132491 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 1100 GMT 7 Jul 91*

[Text] Today I have received a fax message containing the resolution of the meeting devoted to the recall of People's Deputy of Russia Baburin. This event took place in Sovetskiy Rayon of Omsk on 1 July. It was there that Baburin was once elected to the deputies' corps.

The document points out that after having manifested a certain democratism in his activities at the congress and within the republic's parliament, the deputy then started to sharply change his stand. He is constantly involved in discrediting members of Ivan Silayev's government. Moreover, Baburin stooped so low as to blacken and slander Boris Yeltsin, while at the same time promoting Ryzhkov and Zhirinovskiy in every possible way during the election campaign.

We are not against freedom of expression—the resolution reads—nor are we against diversity of views and political stands. We are, however, against abusing the electors' trust and, under the guise of pseudo-democratic demagoguery, achieving the narrow group interests of the party.

In the end, the electors of Sovetskiy Rayon expressed no confidence in Deputy Baburin, and demanded that he be stripped of his deputy's mandate.

Tatar President on Union Treaty, Russian Ties

*LD0707092291 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Jul 91*

[Interview with Mintimer Sharipovich Shaymyev, president of the Tatar Soviet Socialist Republic, by unidentified correspondent; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] A special session of the Tatar Supreme Soviet has ended in Kazan. The people's deputies discussed the results of the presidential election in Tatarstan, and adopted a law on the inauguration of the president of the Tatar Soviet Socialist Republic.

[Correspondent] The new president is Mintimer Shariyev, who used to be chairman of the Republic's Supreme Soviet. The president has been sworn in. Other organizational issues stemming from the introduction of presidential rule in the Republic were settled. The vice president of Tatarstan, the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and the prime minister of the Republic of Tatarstan were elected.

[Shariyev] On the basis of the experience of the new soviets, I think nobody is in any doubt today that executive authority must be strengthened. I consider that presidential rule is the most effective form of authority there is. The important thing is to ensure that it really is effective. But there is another reason why the introduction of presidential rule is very important for the Republic of Tatarstan. It is a factor strengthening our statehood.

We must ensure that the switch to the market is effected less painfully. We expect to sign the Union treaty ourselves, in our own right, as one of the fully entitled founder members of the Union. At the same time we attach exceptional importance to the development and strengthening of multilateral ties with the Russian Federation, ties which have developed in a natural, historical way. This should be done by the conclusion of a treaty between the Republic of Tatarstan and a reinvigorated Russian Federation.

North Ossetian Congress Ends in Vladikavkaz

LD0707091191 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz July 6 TASS—A new model of settling complicated inter-ethnic problems in the North Caucasian region was in the focus of attention of delegates and guests of the first Congress of North Ossetian Peoples, which ended today in Vladikavkaz, capital of this Caucasian republic.

For two days representatives of about 100 nations living in North Ossetia met in the national drama theatre named after Vladimir Tkhaspayev, which was carefully guarded by militia units (the state of emergency has been imposed on Vladikavkaz). They discussed with interest complicated problems dealing with inter-ethnic relations, trying to find a way out of the economic and social crisis.

Representatives of various social and professional groups spoke at the congress with concern about tension in inter-ethnic relations in the North Caucasian region. They were especially worried about negative trends in inter-ethnic relations that appeared recently in North Ossetia. Tension in the republic is being kindled by some extremist-minded Ingushes. The congress of the Ingush people, held recently, adopted a declaration on the need for creating an Ingush republic with the capital in the right-bank part of Vladikavkaz.

Residents of North Ossetia support the desire of the Ingush people to create a republic of their own, but they strongly oppose the revision of borders and the territorial division of North Ossetia. An endless flow of Ossetian refugees from South Ossetia and other parts of Georgia is another destabilising factor in the republic. According to official statistics, some 35,000 refugees have been registered in Vladikavkaz. The republic has exhausted its potential, needed for their accommodation.

Speakers at the congress stressed the need for creating equal conditions for the development of all nations inhabiting the republic, for the preservation of culture, traditions, religion and languages of small ethnic groups. The congress ended with the adoption of an appeal to Soviet President Gorbachev, Russian President Yeltsin, peoples of North Ossetia and northern Caucasus. It was suggested at the forum that the first congress of peoples of the Soviet Union be organised.

Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Interviewed

LD0407093691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1250 GMT 3 Jul 91

[Interview with Andrey Vladimirovich Fedorov, deputy foreign minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, by Andrey Allakhverdov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Will we ever become a part of the world economic community? Presently many people are placing their hopes on the forthcoming meeting between President Gorbachev and the leaders of the countries of the Big Seven, taking place soon in London. What things were like in the past, in the sense of economic treaties, we know from historians. What they are like today we know from the British Embassy official. But what will things be like tomorrow? What does our Russian Government think about this? Our correspondent Andrey Allakhverdov put this question to Andrey Fedorov, Russian deputy foreign minister.

[Fedorov] I have no illusions that this trip will immediately bring any visible results and so on, credits. The mood is presently very restrained. The most we can probably count on is help in obtaining new technology and the like. At the same time it must be borne in mind that this help will be given to us only in the event that the Yavlinskiy program is presented. This is really the last chance because the West is not prepared and does not intend to work with us on other conditions. Money which disappears into the sand is money lost both for the West and for the USSR.

I think that we have certain good prospects at bilateral level, you understand; first of all, this is because the expansion of economic autonomy and the sovereignty of Russia is quite evident. Now people are making contact with us not just as some theoretical partner but as a partner which has something to back it up, which is backed up by resources, even if not fully; it is backed up by certain financial possibilities and so on.

There are several areas here. First, we are counting on the implementation of those accords which were concluded in preliminary form during Boris Nikolayevich's trip to the United States. Now we are ourselves, autonomously as Russia, resolving questions of the purchase of grain, for example in Canada. Unfortunately, this obligatory measure still remains. Likewise, in accordance with the results of Boris Nikolayevich's visit to Czechoslovakia, questions are being decided and a mechanism is beginning to operate for making deliveries to us of food products and so on. We, unlike the Union, proposed returning to the form which existed previously—settling accounts in national currencies, balanced in accordance with world prices, but not settling accounts in freely convertible currency because neither side wishes this. In many ways, by the way, thanks to this position of ours, at the funeral session of CEMA there was talk of returning to this mechanism in relations with all countries that were previously members of CEMA. However, it is difficult for us to begin with because not everyone accepts us as a really sovereign partner. Very many are accustomed to deal only with the center.

[Allakhverdov] In this connection I have a question. Some time ago, Boris Nikolayevich went to France and there, in my opinion, Europe's preference for the Union as a united state and not for Russia as a sovereign state was most clearly revealed. I believe.

[Fedorov] I would not say that this is completely so. I was on that trip with Boris Nikolayevich and I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears. The question is rather different. During that visit Boris Nikolayevich undertook a very difficult job, in an unofficial atmosphere to explain very frankly what Russia is today and what the changes are that are taking place in Russia. By the way, this produced its results. The most interesting, the most paradoxical—you remember how much fuss there was about this trip,—but the first, one of the very first people to congratulate Boris Nikolayevich on his victory in the election was Crespo, chairman of the European Parliament. That was also one of the results of the trip.

Of course, it is difficult for them to accept us. You know, the problem is at times not so much with us as with the West. The West is accustomed to single-channel contacts with the USSR, to one clearly bureaucratic system. When it now finds itself in a position when it is possible to work without this bureaucratic system, much more simply, including with Russia, it is at a loss.

Well, of course there are still the questions of licences, customs posts and so, and all the more so since, as you know, the central government is unfortunately once again taking steps to restrict the possibilities of foreign economic sovereignty for our state. Now, however, for example, an agreement has been signed between us and Hercegovina—that is, one of the parts of Yugoslavia. Ivan Stepanovich signed an agreement yet again on development and cooperation. We are now creating together with the Slovaks—we have virtually moved on

to a very considerable—a Russian-Slovak bank. That is, we are creating, trying to create an infrastructure which would be independent to a certain extent from the actions of the central government and which would be in the interests of Russia, first of all in the resolution of financial and material questions, in the system of reciprocal deliveries, and so on.

[Allakhverdov] You said that you are placing great hopes on the implementation of the Yavlinskiy program. As far as I understand it, it is not ruled out that there may be a repeat of the episode; recently in the press I found terms like Michurin-style economic plant-breeding and attempts to cross the Pavlov program with the Yavlinskiy program. What will happen in this case?

[Fedorov] I think that in this case we shall get the crisis that we got once before with the 500 days program. To tell the truth, I know Yavlinskiy quite well and I know that he will write a third program. He is a brave man and he'll survive this, too. What is at issue, however, is that the country will not survive this, will not stand this. Really, it is necessary to be totally frank now and say that we must take advantage of this chance. The key to taking advantage of this chance lies in the West, whether we like it or not. It is not a question of cash or credits, but for us, together with the West, a full audit and alteration of the infrastructure of our economy and of our industry, in the first place. If this chance is not implemented, we should not harbor illusions. The West will not longer invest money in an economy where one man can make decisions changing thousands of millions of rubles, ruining things, or introducing a tax, and so on. That is not the sort of economy that the West is prepared to invest in.

[Allakhverdov] And it will not give credits, either.

[Fedorov] It will not give credits because, you know, there are limits to all credits. Credits must be paid for. The Union is now incapable of doing that. One of the elements of Yavlinskiy's thought, Yavlinskiy's approach, and the approach to this question of the chairman of the Council of Ministers and Boris Nikolayevich, personally, proposes: Let us divide up the state debt amongst the republics; let us see what the republics really owe; let us pay the state debt ourselves; and thus we shall deal directly with the creditors, that is, with the West, in the first instance. Then the principle of relations will be different because Russia will have an interest in paying off this debt and receiving new credits. At present the old system is faltering more and more every day.

[Allakhverdov] Andrey Vladimirovich, toward which countries will Russia's foreign policy be oriented? On the former socialist countries, the EC, America, or the developed countries of Southeast Asia?

[Fedorov] We would not want to divide them clearly up into first, second, and third, although we undoubtedly have priorities. One can set them out like this: The first, of course, are the contiguous countries, the countries with which we have joint frontiers, with which we are linked by particular geographic and historical relations.

These include Japan, Finland, China. Then there are undoubtedly what we now call the countries of the socialist past. We cannot get away from the fact that our economies are interlinked. You can see how many problems we have inside the country because the settlement of accounts in freely convertible currency was introduced totally without being thought through. That means that today we have Tatra lorries, Icarus buses standing idle. We have no Bulgarian tomatoes, and so on, and so on.

In foreign relations there is no doubt that the economic factor is very important. Plus, of course, of fundamental importance are relations with the United States and Canada, Southeast Asia, undoubtedly—this includes Japan, South Korea because the development of Siberia and the Far East is impossible without attracting funds from them and without bringing in their technology. In principle, the most important feature of Russian foreign policy, if it can be expressed in one word, is pragmatism in order to stabilize internal life. That is, to construct foreign policy primarily proceeding from the interests of Russia. This includes the idea that foreign policy should play a very important role in ensuring foreign economic assistance.

That is, we must renounce ideological stereotypes in developing links with these countries and we must show that we can do this or that, we can give you this, we cannot do this. Let us construct relations as equal and normal partners.

The most dangerous thing is if we now begin to engage in seeking allies. At present we do not need allies of Russia abroad. We need partners, partners who will deal with us responsibly, and we shall correspondingly deal with them responsibly. This is possible only if we renounce any element of thinking in terms of blocs.

[Allakhverdov] You are thinking about CEMA?

[Fedorov] I am thinking about CEMA and the Warsaw Treaty, and the attempts which are being made at Union level presently to include in treaties with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland articles restricting the sovereignty of these states.

[Allakhverdov] What is the reaction of the former socialist countries to Russia's autonomous entry into the international arena? You have just said that Russia is concluding a treaty with Slovakia.

[Fedorov] We have a very good atmosphere, purely human and businesslike, of course. Last year we signed a declaration jointly with Poland, between Russia and Poland. On 15 May Boris Nikolayevich signed a joint declaration with Czechoslovakia. That is, we have separate trade and economic agreements with Slovakia and the Czech lands, but with Czechoslovakia as a subject at international level. Presently similar work is in progress with Hungary: we are already at the stage of harmonizing the text. Boris Nikolayevich has been invited to

Romania in the autumn. There is an invitation to Bulgaria precisely as a subject of international law. In this sense it is a matter of Russia concluding its own specific treaties. At the level of the Union we are not opposed to there being framework agreements, framework treaties between, say, Bulgarian and the USSR. Russia has no objection and cannot have.

Specific accords for cooperation, however, particularly in the sphere of the economy, culture, and so on are possible now only at the level of republics. You understand that the conclusion of an agreement with the USSR Ministry of Culture does not mean that there will be a cultural exchange today. Accordingly, in this event Russia is prepared to work on its own autonomous treaties, agreements, and so on. We already have many examples of this at the level of various ministries. We shall actively continue this.

Of course, without doubt... [changes thought] what by the way Yeltsin first began discussing in Strasbourg, there is our rapprochement with the EEC. We must really face the truth. The EC is becoming the most influential economic and political force on the continent. Within a few years the former socialist countries and so on and so forth will enter the EC. We must deal with the EC as a vast and powerful subject. We must prepare ourselves for integration in the EC, naturally on specific conditions of preserving our state sovereignty and much else. But without the development of links with the EC in the sphere of the economy, in the sphere of law, including the sphere of policy, which I would now place in third place, we shall not be able to be part of Europe as we genuinely wish to be.

[Allakhverdov] As far as I understand it, the EC is not particularly enthusiastic about the entry of the former socialist countries, and I think that they will have the same attitude to us.

[Fedorov] One can put it like this: No one wants to put on a hauberk when it is possible to put on a light dress. The EC is not opposed to drawing closer to us. But they cannot, and many of their leaders say it frankly, they cannot draw closer to us in conditions in which there are no reforms in our economy. Structures can only draw together and convergence can only take place when the structures have similar elements and these similar elements are the market economy, the mechanisms of the market economy. Two completely different systems cannot draw together. Such a drawing together will lead only to conflict. The situation at the present time is that the EC is not going to reform itself; that is quite clear. We must take on ourselves full responsibility for reform in our country if we want to draw closer to it, if we want understanding with the EC, and so on. The Russian Federation is starting to take this step—slowly and with difficulty because we have very many conflicts, including the problems between Russia and the center. The fact, however, that this movement has already started, the fact that it will make progress is perfectly clear.

Belorussia

Kebich Criticizes Cabinet Resolution

PM0507112991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jun 91 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with V. Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, by correspondent O. Stepanenko under "Topical Interview" rubric; date not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "What Do We Offer—Prosperity or Chaos?"]

[Text] Minsk—As is well known, V. Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, has voiced sharp criticism of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution on organizational measures in the elaboration of production programs for the socioeconomic development of enterprises in the regions, republics, and the USSR for 1992 in conditions of the formation of market relations. He asked the Belorussian parliament to take concrete measures against the central government's decision. Reports on that appeared in the mass media, including those abroad. Our correspondent met with V. Kebich and asked him to talk about the extraordinary situation that has been created.

[Stepanenko] Vyacheslav Frantsevich, when addressing the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session, you stated that the decisions adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers are destructive regarding the Belorussian economy, do not aid progress toward the republics' economic autonomy, and essentially undermine the idea of the Nine plus One agreement and the draft Union Treaty.

[Kebich] Yes. I said that not only at the session but also at the Belorussian agrarian congress, in telephone conversations with V. Pavlov, and at meetings with representatives of the public and the mass media.

[Stepanenko] The accusation is very serious, and I hope you are fully aware of the kind of instability it might detonate.

[Kebich] Of course. Nevertheless, the resolution, if implemented, will not be a detonator but a bomb capable of destroying the republic's economy.

[Stepanenko] What is there to corroborate that?

[Kebich] Let us begin with how the resolution envisages the formation of the state order and its provision with resources. You understand that this is the initial, basic question of production. That's how it is. The level of the state order is set at around 50 percent in the processing industry and around 70 percent in the extractive industry. What does this mean? Belorussia, as is well known, is not a republic rich in raw materials. In the main ours are processing enterprises. Consequently, they will receive half their resources through the state order system. The rest they will have to seek at contract prices. In today's conditions of monopoly production this will

result in an unchecked and uncontrollable rise in prices. I would call it price madness. Distress signals are already coming in from all over the place. They give a clearer picture of the scale of the impending calamity.

[Stepanenko] Can you give us some concrete facts?

[Kebich] Of course. I have here a telegram from the Pinsk Textiles and Knitwear Association. It receives the bulk of its raw materials, wool, from Kyrgyzstan. "In connection with the USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the application of contract prices, suppliers are proposing a premium of 225-235 percent for wool. Refuse and they stop supplies." Do you see? They have increased prices by almost two-and-a-half times. Talks have led nowhere. The association is forced to agree, otherwise all the republic's knitwear enterprises will come to a standstill. Losses from the application of contract prices for wool, the telegram says, will be 107 million rubles [R] over the year.

Belorussia does not import just wool but a vast amount of other raw materials, too. It imports all its fuel and metal, for example. We are losing billions of rubles. On this score alone the republic faces economic ruin. The Cabinet of Ministers resolution will deal our agriculture an even worse blow.

[Stepanenko] What do you mean?

[Kebich] The resolution essentially deprives Belorussia of its imported grain. Nature herself has preordained that our Belorussian land shall bring forth milk, meat, and other livestock produce. Zonal specialization is the core of agriculture in any civilized country. I would go further: In deference to nature's laws, the West applies the principle of specialization on a transcontinental scale. Greece and African countries cultivate alfalfa and other crop seeds for Northern and Central Europe, for example. Borders are no obstacle. But even within the country we cannot make use of nature's gifts. Sadly, we act contrary to its laws. Instead of obtaining part of our grain from regions where conditions are more appropriate to its cultivation—the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and the grain-growing areas of Russia—and giving the country milk, meat, and eggs, Belorussia will be forced to increase the area sown to grain, which will involve higher costs here, and reduce the production of livestock output.

Right now, even such a major farm as the "Rassvet" Kolkhoz named for K. Orlovskiy, which has achieved the highest density of livestock and the most advanced world levels in technology and the production of meat and milk, has slaughtered part of the herd because of the short supply of grain. I am not going to cite the figures for the decrease in animal numbers. I shall merely note that they are more than alarming. Yet Belorussia supplies the Union fund with much meat and milk. And what is equally alarming is that, because of the violation of zonal specialization, the global product is declining sharply. Thus the resolution is tightening the noose of hunger around the neck not only of our republic,

[Stepanenko] Do you mean that it has no firm scientific foundation?

[Kebich] What foundation? What science? Simple arithmetic has been overlooked here. Judge for yourself. The resolution imposes a federal tax of 10 percent of the value of output sold. For our republic, with its great sales volumes, this means a more than threefold increase to the Union budget—around R8-9 billion. But that is almost one-half of the republic's budget. This point will undermine the Belorussian economy.

[Stepanenko] You are repeating what you said at the session.

[Kebich] I am not repeating but reemphasizing. There is a striking paradox here. An ever-increasing number of rights, primarily economic, are being proclaimed for the republics, oblasts, and so forth. And ever-increasing financial contributions are planned for the center. With no consideration for the effect on production or the economy. All the payments which one way or another affect the center's command interests are planned to be included in output prime cost. There is absolutely no connection with the end results of the work of an enterprise or organization. You have to contribute to the Union budget and to nonbudget funds whether you make a profit or not. What does that encourage? A new price spiral. Not just wholesale prices—ultimately it all filters through to retail prices.

[Stepanenko] To sum up?

[Kebich] The resolution places the republics in an economic vise in the interests of the central organs. That is its main defect. The methods they use to try to persuade the public of the thorough preparation of the resolution are frightening. The resolution cites the fact that all the planned measures correspond to the program of joint actions of the Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the sovereign republics to bring the country's economy out of crisis. I categorically repudiate that. The program does not contain the provisions that have gone into the cabinet's resolution.

There is another point. Our human suffering connected with Chernobyl. What, do you think, is the upshot of the decision to allocate the resources needed to eliminate the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station not directly from the Union budget but by proportional fixed contributions from the republics? Putting it simply, in our bitter distress they were suggesting that we pass the hat around and beg for handouts.

[Stepanenko] At the Belorussian Supreme Soviet session you proposed a number of tough measures aimed against the ill-considered cabinet resolution. And the immediate transfer to republic jurisdiction of all enterprises and organizations on its territory.

[Kebich] Yes. In addition, I asked the Supreme Soviet for powers—to most firmly oppose the Cabinet of Ministers resolution, which undermines the Union. I take

this opportunity to appeal to PRAVDA. Help! It is distressing when we are the cause of our own undoing. Where, after all, is the fulfillment of our own accord that major decisions will be made jointly?

Ukraine

Supreme Soviet Discusses Office of President

LD0607134991 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 4 Jul 91

[By parliamentary correspondent Serhiy Hubin]

[Excerpts] At the morning sitting [of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet] discussion was raging around the Cabinet of Ministers' anti-crisis program—especially powers, among them the right to suspend certain articles in the bills recently adopted by the Supreme Soviet. This has split the parliament right in the middle. [passage omitted]

Many speakers expressed concern that the Cabinet of Ministers, having obtained special powers, may usurp the powers of the parliament. Some of them stressed that under such conditions the Supreme Soviet would only go through motions, as its decisions would have no potency. [passage omitted] In the end it was decided to grant the Cabinet the right to suspend certain articles or parts of bills for no longer than one year. [passage omitted]

Then the parliament returned to the question of the post of the president and his powers. Most of the people's deputies are in favor of introducing the president's office. They believe that this innovation will augment the executive branch of government. [passage omitted]

First, the parliament made some changes in the Constitution, to accommodate the novelty. Now the Constitution prescribes that the president of the Ukraine is the highest ranking official in charge of executive powers in the Republic. [Passage omitted] A person running for president must not be younger than 35 years. It was decided not to fix the upper age limit. The same person can hold office for no more than two terms, one term lasting for 5 years. The president cannot be a member of parliament, nor can he hold other state offices or engage in commercial activities. The parliament rejected one deputy's proposal that the post would not be occupied by a person with a prison record. Should such a clause be included, then more than 10 deputies in this parliament would be deprived of the right to run, as in the stagnation years they were accused of dissidence and persecuted.

On the whole, the mechanism of presidential powers resembles that existing in many civilized countries. [passage omitted] The president will represent the Ukraine in the international arena.

The clause on the office of the vice president was discussed in the second reading. The parliament came to

the conclusion that it needs further improvement and polishing. The deputies decided to return to it tomorrow. [passage omitted]

Confrontation With Center Discussed

LD0707174791 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 0000 GMT
7 Jul 91

[Text] The decision of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet to abolish action of certain Union (?normative) acts on the territory of the Ukraine has evoked a wide resonance in the world. Radio Kiev listeners would like to know if the national parliament is confronting the center. Here is a comment by Radio Kiev's Sergey (?Gubin) as translated into English.

In this respect the estimation of the actions by the Ukraine Supreme Soviet is simultaneous [as heard]. All without exception [among the] parliamentarians I was talking with today said that confrontation with the center becomes evident. This is not our fault but that of the center. The latest actions by the union government had negative consequences for the entire country's economy and has for the economy of our republic. Suffice it to recall the recent exchange of bank notes worth R50 and R100 in the Soviet Union. Experts have proved that the center had not reached a required goal to undermine the shadow economy. Instead the social tension in our society has grown, especially after an attempt of the union government to reform its price policy. According to the Soviet economists, including Ukrainian, due to a sharp growth in prices on 2 April this year almost two-thirds of the country's population have found themselves off the poverty limit. Compensational measures are not capable of saving the situation. An average monthly earnings here if transferred into a convertible currency does not even reach \$12. The list of similar (?unthoughtful) actions by the center can be prolonged. Suffice it to mention the president's decree on delivering 40 percent of currency incomes at Ukraine's enterprises to the all-Union budget; it is an undisguised robbing of Ukraine.

This is how a People's Deputy [words indistinct] commented (on) the situation: Because our republic mostly exports goods than imports, especially those which are produced at large industrial enterprises with sophisticated technology. While feeding the center with currency Ukraine does not have enough (?for) itself. Another People's Deputy Mikhail (?Shwanka) in his interview for the Ukrainian newspaper MOLOD UKRAINY gives the following facts: Last year Ukraine extracted oil and gas to the sum of three billion 800 million rubles. And what were those resources spent for? The production of goods which were delivered beyond the borders of Ukraine. The figures prove that in many cases Ukraine's economy does not satisfy its own needs, meet production of sugar or bread, which is quite extensive here in our republic. The transition from a planned bureaucratic system to the market economy is not the matter of one day, the problem should be solved in a complex way. Having remained part and parcel of the old union economy Ukraine has intention to independently pursue its domestic and foreign policy. The anti-crisis program of our republic has been worked out on the principles of the declaration on Ukraine's state sovereignty, of the law on (?its) economic independence. Therefore our parliament stopped certain (?normative) acts of the union acted on the territory of the Ukraine, first of all those are decrees which deal with a currency settlement. It was the president's decree, it was a resolution of the Council of Ministers, then there was a resolution on taxes for export and import. (?When) it was abolished, as well as other resolutions by the center government. We are forming our own statehood, our own sovereignty. The key problem here is introduction of our own monetary unit as well as [word indistinct] of our economic and financial system. Unless we solve all these problems it is hard to foresee what measures the center will invent in reply and how we will be able to counteract. I would say that the center's undertakings against Lithuania had an even more negative impact on the center itself than on Lithuania. This is why similar actions on the part of the center against Ukraine would be a kind of a political adventurism taking into consideration the Ukraine's potential.

Georgia

Gamsakhurdia Speaks to Hungarian Journalist

AU0507170791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA
in Russian 21 June p 1,2

[“President Z. Gamsakhurdia Answers Questions From Hungarian Correspondent Kh. Babirak”—place and date not given]

[Text] [Babirak] First and foremost, I would like to congratulate you on your splendid election victory. I was surprised by the announcement in Hungary that presidential elections were going to be held in Georgia. Were these elections necessary given that you had already been elected by parliament?

[Gamsakhurdia] In a number of European countries, including Hungary, the president is elected by parliament. The powers of a president elected by the people are in no way greater than those of a president elected by parliament. Furthermore, the constitution of one country or another and the ruling political parties themselves define the specific way in which a citizen is nominated for the presidency, proceeding from the historical conditions that have taken shape and the political situation in each individual country.

As you know, the institute of the post of president was introduced here recently and, indeed, the Georgian parliament initially endowed me with such high powers and, then, my powers were finally confirmed by means of nationwide elections. Naturally, I will hold them for the period that is laid down in our Constitution. I should point out in all fairness that, from the start, I was in favor of nationwide elections and, although having been already elected by parliament, I insisted that they should be held.

It seems to me that a vote of confidence by the whole nation is preferable to a vote of confidence by parliament despite the fact that the latter has been elected in a democratic way by the same people. There is one other significant point that needs to be made in this connection: There are more candidates for the post of president in nationwide elections and the election campaign gives one the opportunity to compare one's program with those of one's opponents and to heed all that is rational and constructive in their criticisms. All things considered, nationwide elections are a good school for each citizen, including presidential candidates, as they enable them to assimilate precisely democratic forms and means of conducting a political struggle.

[Babirak] What would you like to say to the Hungarian readers about the elections? How would you sum up the results of these elections? We saw you on Hungarian TV, we heard your speech, and we also saw the National Guard parade.

[Gamsakhurdia] In summarizing the results of the elections, we believe it is possible to highlight several important factors:

a) More than 80 percent of voters participated in the elections and this is a high indicator of the political activity of the people. As you know, the number of voters participating in similar elections in many of the industrially developed Western countries is far less. Sociologists in Western countries complain about the political indifference of certain sectors of the population;

b) Of all the political parties and organizations (we have several dozen in Georgia), the leading position is maintained by the parties and organizations that make up the “Roundtable—Free Georgia” bloc which, in actual fact, also nominated me for such a high and responsible post;

c) Georgia is a multinational country in the sense that, from ancient times, Georgians have shared their bread with the representatives of the many nationalities that are living here. Interethnic relations have been developing here over centuries; national enmity is alien to the Georgians. A high sense of humanism and common human ideals can be tested, first and foremost, in interethnic relations. In this sense, Tbilisi has been and remains a specific model of mutual understanding and mutual respect.

Tbilisi's schools, faculties, theaters, radio programs, printing houses, papers, and journals, all in national languages, easily distinguish it from many large cities in the Soviet Union. Therefore, Moscow can in no way teach us how we should respect the culture and national dignity of the representatives of other nationalities, not having even one school per 100,000 non-Russian Moscovites. The elections showed that the overwhelming majority (from 70 to 90 percent in certain regions) of representatives of the non-Georgian population supported my candidacy and, therefore, the Georgian leadership. This would have been impossible if, as Moscow maintains, we had been persecuting and oppressing the representatives of other nationalities.

d) International observers and foreign correspondents pointed out that the elections took place without any violations and in the spirit of the free expression of the citizens' will. Of course, taking into account the fact that such elections were being held here for the first time, there were certain curious incidents: Several presidential candidates declared that they were being denied access to the mass media despite the fact that they made such declarations and delivered expansive speeches publicly on TV and had them published in the republic's official press.

[Babirak] How do you see Georgia's future? How optimistic are you regarding the question of independence?

[Gamsakhurdia] Georgia will acquire its independence without fail; this is the will of all our people. How soon this will be depends, to a large degree, on the processes

occurring in the Soviet Union, on international solidarity, and on the recognition by Moscow and the other world's capitals of the right of nations, in this case Georgia, to self-determination.

[Babirak] How do you view the prospects for the development of Hungarian-Georgian relations?

[Gamsakhurdia] A number of your questions refer to Hungarian-Georgian relations and, to a significant degree, the prospects for such relations since we are only in the process of establishing the first contacts and ties with Hungary. As part of the Soviet empire, we did not have direct links with many countries in the world and, to a large extent, this is still the case today. After all, if Moscow was exporting certain goods and raw materials that were being produced in Georgia, without our knowledge and consent, to certain countries, including Hungary, you would not call this direct economic or trade relations. Of course, literature and culture, as a whole, knows no political frontiers and, in this sense, Georgia and Hungary do not view one another simply as geographical entities. Having been included against its will in the Warsaw military-political bloc, Hungary has nevertheless been functioning as a subject of international politics and has been implementing—true, under Moscow's eye—its foreign national policy. Contemporary Hungary is a country that has already acquired its national sovereignty whereas we still haven't shaken off the imperialist shackles although, over the last year and a bit, we have done quite a lot in order to achieve real independence. At the same time, we now have to take the first steps into the international arena with one eye on Moscow. Such are the realities of political life. We are also well aware that it is impossible to move forward quickly when we are constantly having to look back.

In order to strengthen friendly ties with Hungary, we consider it essential to hold summit meetings that would give us the opportunity to conduct negotiations on a whole range of political, economic, and cultural contacts. It would be expedient to create a joint permanent economic commission. It would be highly worthwhile to have interparliamentary and interdepartmental links and links between industrial enterprises. Therefore, we will welcome and support the initiative shown both in Georgia and Hungary. We thank the Hungarian people for having sent us humanitarian aid in connection with the natural disaster that we suffered. Your trucks arrived here via Turkey. We hope that, in the future, we will be able to establish direct air and sea communications between our countries.

I would personally welcome the resumption of the study of Hungarian in the Tbilisi Foreign Languages Institute, teacher exchanges, and joint scientific research, including the defense of doctoral dissertations by foreigners at Tbilisi University.

It is obvious that we must now organize the exchange of information between our two countries. We believe it is possible to open, on an equal basis, cultural information

centers in Georgia and Hungary. Our side will undertake to provide accommodation and salaries for our Hungarian colleagues and you, in your turn, will receive our envoys under the same conditions. I recently spoke on the telephone with Mr. Arpad Goncz, the Hungarian president, about all this. I am very pleased with our conversation. Mr. Akaki Asatiani, the chairman of our parliament, has already been invited to visit Hungary by the speaker of the Hungarian parliament. I hope that a meeting will also be arranged between myself and Mr. A. Goncz.

[Babirak] You have established a National Guard. What will its function be?

[Gamsakhurdia] The National Guard represents a formation of the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs. Its aim, as that of other militia units, is to maintain public order.

[Babirak] When are you planning to promulgate the Law on Land?

[Gamsakhurdia] A parliamentary commission is working intensively on clarifying the contents and wording of this bill. We expect to discuss this matter very soon at a session of parliament.

[Babirak] What is the current situation in Samachablo, former "South Ossetia"?

[Gamsakhurdia] The situation has, on the whole, become stable and relatively calm. A joint parliamentary commission composed of Supreme Soviet deputies from the USSR, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and Georgia is continuing its work. I recently implemented a recommendation of this commission by addressing the population of the region. I gave guarantees that those Ossetian militants who voluntarily surrender their weapons will not be liable to criminal prosecution.

[Babirak] How do you envisage relations between your republic and those republics that are planning to sign the Union treaty and those that are planning to leave the Union?

[Gamsakhurdia] Georgia's geopolitical situation makes it necessary to have stable relations with its direct and distant neighbors irrespective of whether they remain part of the Soviet Union or whether, in accordance with the USSR Constitution and international law and practice, they leave the Union. We are interested in the process that began in Novo-Ogarevo. For the first time, during six years of perestroika, the sovereignty of the republics has started to be reinforced with real substance. Gorbachev used the expression "endowing the sovereignty of the republics with real substance" and we welcome this process if it will be implemented in practice. I repeat that this process has only just begun and there are forces in the Soviet Union for whom even a totalitarian Soviet state is unacceptable; they prefer a Russian empire instead of the republican provinces that,

as things stand, have no rights. For imperialist thinking, it is unacceptable if Russia will occupy one-fifth instead of one-sixth of the world's territory. According to the imperialist vision, the whole of the Soviet Union is "one, indivisible Rus'." What constitutes the greatest paradox is the fact that many of these imperialists are proud of the fact that they are Communists although one cannot be a Communist without recognizing the right of nations to self-determination. From a moral and ethical point of view, they believe that it is wholly possible to profess one thing in theory and to do another in practice.

Georgia supports the maintenance and even the expansion of political, economic, and other ties with the Union republics but on condition that our national sovereignty is fully recognized.

[Babirak] We know that Georgia has put forward an initiative to resolve the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict. What can you tell us about this?

[Gamsakhurdia] The Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict has been going on for several years. However, the reason for this is not national enmity and this is not an "ethnic conflict" as the same imperialist forces like to call it. The Caucasian people have sufficient common sense in order to sort out their own problems and restore good relations in those places where these have suffered. Our proposals are being studied by both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani sides; we expect to hold consultations and a series of meetings in order to bring the sides closer together and to elaborate mutually acceptable solutions. However, the reactionary forces of the center want to hinder our initiative.

[Babirak] What are you expecting from your meetings with Gorbachev and Bush?

[Gamsakhurdia] We are hoping for a consultative dialogue with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. After all, a policy of applying strong pressure on those republics that have embarked upon the path of democratic changes and the restoration of their statehood is hopeless. According to our information, the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] is already in the process of preparing a "package" of proposals aimed at declaring an economic war against a number of republics. No matter how often M.S. Gorbachev has called upon them to adopt "new thinking," Gosplan workers and a number of central ministries are adhering to the old stereotypes: "Punish them." The state to which the economy has been brought by the last Cabinet of Ministers, including Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance, and so forth is well known to everyone. Why shouldn't we raise the question of punishing those responsible for the collapse of the Soviet economy, including the Georgian economy?

The entire world community has expressed its solidarity and condolences in connection with the tragic events of 9 April 1989. After two years of investigation, the USSR Procurator's Office "has not found the corpus delicti of the crime." Indeed, the USSR leaders have been making repeated pronouncements about the construction of a

rule-of-law state but, if it will take as long as the construction of "developed socialism," it is better if we ourselves establish order in the paternal home.

National independence is not the whim of one person or even of one party or parties but the will of millions of my compatriots.

We hope to expound to President Bush our vision of the processes occurring in the Soviet Union, including the prospects for American-Georgian relations.

[Babirak] Zviad Konstantinovich, you have received an enormous spiritual inheritance from your father. Does it help you to resolve contemporary problems?

[Gamsakhurdia] My father's influence upon me has been enormous since my childhood. With his help I became aware of reality as it was. All our family has always been opposed to the ruling regime. The leading members of the intelligentsia always used to gather at our apartment and they would condemn the negative phenomena of society at that time. From childhood, I used to listen to many of my father's conversations with his friends who hoped to live to see the happy day when Georgia would be free.

[Babirak] Your father was no doubt also persecuted. After all, expressing one's opinion aloud and, furthermore, criticizing the regime at that time was fraught with troubles and meant even risking one's life.

[Gamsakhurdia] You are absolutely right. Indeed, my father spent three years in exile in a camp in the far north where human survival was almost impossible. People used to die there like flies and the majority of them were representatives of the Russian intelligentsia. However, there were also Europeans in the camp whose crimes were unknown. Many of these died. My father often used to recall an elegant Hungarian officer who was locked up in one hut. He was not given bread and water for two months. This bold spirit who had his own opinion about socialism was starved to death. Every day, my father used to witness executions by firing squad, murders, and deaths as a result of hard backbreaking labor. His health was considerably undermined. Nevertheless, he was not left in peace. Our house was often searched and property confiscated. The KGB took away a unique archive that included, among other materials, letters from Thomas Mann to my father. He was also slandered in the press where he was labelled a German spy on account of his correspondence with T. Mann.

[Babirak] As far as I know, your father knew a lot of Hungarians and met them during his trip to Hungary.

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes. He met them while he was studying at Berlin University. He liked them a lot. Incidentally, one of the main characters in his novel "The Abduction of the Moon" is Sandor Secheni, a Hungarian. This is not a coincidence.

[Babirak] Your father wrote the novel "The Abduction of the Moon." You have published an anthology of

poems entitled "The Betrothal of the Moon." Have you become betrothed to some idea, some mission? What do you mean by the word "betrothal?"

[Gamsakhurdia] Perhaps, that's exactly it. The moon is a symbol of romanticism. On the other hand, it is also a symbol of Georgian spiritual culture. This dual symbol also appears in my father's novel; it represents Georgia's supreme deity that is fated to perish in a totalitarian state, in a 20th century empire, in the enraged river of a barbaric revolution. In my book, the expression "The Betrothal of the Moon" reflects faith in the future and also hope for a future marriage, that is to say, the regeneration, prosperity, and happiness of my people.

[Babirak] Mr. Zviad, you have had a hard life. You have often been imprisoned for your beliefs, you have been persecuted, and you were even expelled from the Georgian Writers' Union. Nevertheless, you have remained faithful to your idea of achieving freedom for Georgia. How do you manage to combine both your literary and political activities?

[Gamsakhurdia] This is extremely difficult. Politics is alien to literature. Very alien. One could even say that it contradicts literature. For many years my literary works were not published for some unknown reason. My involvement in politics does not mean that I am abandoning literature.

[Babirak] How do you explain the fact that in many of the former socialist countries (Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Georgia) famous writers, historians, pedagogues, and other humanitarians are becoming politicians?

[Gamsakhurdia] I believe that there is a greater desire than ever among the people to restore spiritual values that were on the verge of extinction during the technocratic era. People see salvation in humanism and trust those humanitarians who can lead the struggle for the independence and freedom of their peoples.

[Babirak] These words are particularly precious to us Hungarians and we know their value...

[Gamsakhurdia] The revolution was crushed in Hungary when I was first arrested in December 1956. In my first proclamations I was urging not only my fellow citizens but also Hungarians to seek independence. I was asked about this during my interrogation and my reply was as follows: There was a revolution in Hungary but you called it a fascist putsch and cruelly drowned it in blood.

Freedom and independence mean the same thing for us as they do for Hungarians. Liberation from the Soviet dictate, the removal of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory, and much else unites us. I am convinced that both you and we will achieve our desired freedom.

Gamsakhurdia Views Control of Nuclear Arms

PM0507202291 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 6 Jul 91 p 3

[Interview with Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia by correspondent Aleksandr Oskin at U.S. ambassador's residence on 4 July: "Zviad Gamsakhurdia Stakes No Claim to Nuclear Weapons"]

[Excerpt] A reception to mark the 215th anniversary of U.S. Independence Day was held the day before yesterday at the residence of J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR. Among the guests were Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia and his wife. Your correspondent obtained a brief interview with him.

[Oskin] Mr. President, I represent RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, which, I have heard, you are not very well disposed toward, and I would like to ask you a few questions.

[Gamsakhurdia] I am perfectly well disposed toward RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. I read it regularly. Please ask your questions.

[Oskin] Thank you. M.S. Gorbachev is preparing to go to London. USSR presidential elections are in prospect. Please tell me, on what terms would you be prepared to support Mikhail Sergeyevich?

[Gamsakhurdia] Only on one condition—that he grants complete freedom to all the republics, with no restrictions or conditions.

[Oskin] Suppose that happens, and tomorrow instead of a single Soviet Union, 15, 20, or 40 independent and sovereign states appear. What about the nuclear weapons? How can nuclear weapons be shared out? Does this mean, in your view, that there should be a couple of dozen new nuclear powers, including Georgia?

[Gamsakhurdia] No, it does not mean that. Nuclear weapons should remain under the control of a single center, which may be Russian or Union, but under single control. No way can they be shared out.

[Oskin] What about finances and the money supply?

[Gamsakhurdia] Each republic should be absolutely economically autonomous and have its own monetary unit.

[Oskin] Tell me, how are Russians in Georgia feeling at the moment?

[Gamsakhurdia] Fine, I think. Furthermore, let me tell you, the majority of them voted for me in the elections. And all because we don't confuse Russians with Soviets. Unfortunately some people don't understand that.

[Oskin] What is your view of Landsbergis' idea of a meeting of the republics' leaders on the formula "9 plus 3 plus 3?"

[Gamsakhurdia] I take a negative view. And primarily because I see a certain egotism in this. Mr. Landsbergis wants to solve his problems without taking the other republics' interests into account, and even to their detriment. [Gamsakhurdia ends]

...I thanked the president for the interview, regretting that there was no time or opportunity for a more detailed talk. [passage omitted]

Armenia

Presidium Discusses Army's Intentions

NC0607182291 Yerevan Radio Yerevan
International Service in Armenian 1830 GMT 5 Jul 91

[Excerpt] Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium met on 4 July under Gagik Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet. He briefed the meeting about the situation prevailing in Nagorno-Karabakh on 3 July and noted that according to incoming information, the troops have not carried out large-scale operations during the night, although scores of people were detained. A general tension persists, particularly in Mardakertskiy and Martuninskiy Rayons.

Arutyunyan also emphasized that thanks to efforts by the republic's leadership, it has been possible to prevent a military operation by the 7th Army stationed in Armenia in connection with the incident in Sisianskiy Rayon.

The meeting also examined the work being carried out for the refugees and in particular questions pertaining to the preparation and adoption of a bill on the situation of the refugees in Sisianskiy, and the difficulties being experienced in allocating the necessary funds to house the refugees. It was deemed expedient to prepare a bill on this problem and present it to the Supreme Soviet Presidium. [passage omitted]

[Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian at 1215 GMT on 4 July reports that during an expanded meeting of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium on 3 July, Lieutenant-General Pishchev, commander of the 7th Army, provided information about the incident in Sisianskiy Rayon on the night of 2 July, during which one serviceman was killed and another wounded.

ARMENPRES also reports: "Armenians are being deported from Nagorno-Karabakh in a peculiar manner—by military helicopters. After obtaining ostensibly voluntary signatures for under the barrel of automatic weapons for resettlement, the Armenians are then illegally transported from Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia in military helicopters. One such helicopter crashed while landing near Noravan village in Sisianskiy Rayon. There are injured, but no dead. On the night of 2 July, unidentified persons attacked the troop detail from the 7th Army guarding the helicopter. One serviceman was killed and arms were seized.

"The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium in its 3 July decision assessed the incident as 'an obvious plot to destabilize the situation in the republic.'

"The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium appealed to the USSR Defense Ministry to expose and call to account those persons who are organizing the illegal flights of the military helicopters to deport the Armenian population. The Supreme Soviet Presidium also appealed to the command of the 7th Army stationed in the republic to refrain from operations that are not in agreement with the republican authorities. The Armenian Supreme Soviet and government are taking concrete steps to normalize relations with the Army and border troop units and to disarm those who illegally keep arms."

Army, OMON Operations in NKAO Reported

NC0607185291 Yerevan ARMENPRES International
Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Yerevan 4 Jul (ARMENPRES)—After a certain lull, the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh has worsened once again. The internal troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, together with the Azerbaijani OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment], have launched wide-scale operations against many settlements in Nagorno-Karabakh. It is beyond a shadow of a doubt that these punitive operations—which the center pharisaically describes as the "control of passport regime"—is nothing less than the continuation of the policy of forcible deportation of the oblast's Armenian inhabitants. All this is being done with the knowledge and direct connivance of the center, which has now assumed the sham role of a peacemaker.

Here is the latest situation report:

Shushinskiy Rayon: On 3 July the internal troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry and the Azerbaijani OMON surrounded Karin Tak village. Thirty youths were taken hostage. Twelve men were detained. All of this has been carried out on the orders of the procurator and with the knowledge of the military commandant Zhukov. The detainees have been taken to Lachin or Shusha. Almost the entire population of Karin Tak has moved to Stepanakert. At this moment the women and children have surrounded the building of the oblast procuracy and are asking for help.

According to reliable information, a few houses have been set on fire in Karin Tak. The people from Shusha and the nearby villages are plundering the property of the Karin Tak people. Nearly 100 animals have been driven away from the village. The attackers have used gases against the peaceful population.

Mardakertskiy Rayon: Vaguhas, Arutyunagomer, Tsakahog, Garnakar, Vank, Shahmasur and Aradzhadzor Armenian villages have been surrounded since early this morning. Vank village is being shelled by armoured cars and helicopters.

Askeranskiy Rayon: Virtually all the villages have been surrounded and "passport regime controls" are being conducted.

Martuninskiy Rayon: Norashen, Mushkat, Spitakashen, Ashan and other villages are surrounded by the reinforced internal troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry and by the Azerbaijani OMON.

A concentration of Azerbaijani OMON troops is observed on the borders of Shaumyanovskiy Rayon.

The tension is on the rise in the Armenian settlements in Nagorno-Karabakh and near the Azerbaijani border. It appears that certain forces in Moscow are not heeding the world public opinion and the calls to reason from democratic forces in Russia and elsewhere in the country, and are impudently continuing to implement the pre-planned anti-Armenian campaign.

Nagorno-Karabakh Appeals Army, OMON Actions

NC0607190891 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 4 Jul 91

[Text] Stepanakert, 3 Jul (ARMENPRES)—The situation in Nagorno-Karabakh has again become acute, now for the umpteenth time. On the morning of 3 July, a new wave of passport checks with which we are already too familiar was carried out in a number of Armenian-inhabited settlements in the autonomous oblast by the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachments [OMON] and the internal troops of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry.

The leadership of the oblast soviet executive committee has sent a cable to the USSR president and vice president, chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Committee for State Security, to the ministers of defense and internal affairs, as well as to Genrikh Pogosyan, USSR people's deputy from Nagorno-Karabakh, who is now in Moscow.

The cable states: The operations being undertaken at minimum create apprehension, because following our decision to open up a dialogue—for which the center and Azerbaijan were calling—a tendency towards normalizing inter-ethnic relations was being observed in the

oblast. The persisting tendency to aggravate the situation casts doubt on the numerous declarations of the Azerbaijani leadership to resolve the problem by political means. The cable asks for urgent interference in the situation.

Leonard Petrosyan, interim acting chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee, told an ARMENPRES correspondent: I think the incidents taking place will only postpone the date for starting the dialogue.

Azerbaijan

Gorbachev Lifts Azerbaijan Emergency Decree

PM0507145191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jul 91
Second Edition p 1

[USSR presidential decree: "On Lifting the State of Emergency on the Territory of the Azerbaijan SSR's Geranboyskiy and Dzhebrailskiy Rayons"]

[Text] Given the normalization of the situation in the Geranboyskiy and Dzhebrailskiy Rayons of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], which adjoin the territory of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and guided by Part 2 Article 3 of the USSR Law "On the Legal Arrangements for a State of Emergency," I resolve:

1. To lift the state of emergency brought in by the 15 January 1990 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree "On the Declaration of a State of Emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and Certain Other Areas" (VEDOMOSTI SYEZDA NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV SSSR I VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1990, No. 3, Article 40) on the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR's Geranboyskiy (formerly Shaumyanovskiy) and Dzhebrailskiy Rayons.

2. To place on record the statement by Azerbaijani President A.N. Mutalibov that every measure will be taken to safeguard the security of the population living in the Karabakh conflict zone, to rule out any case of unjustified resettlement of local inhabitants, and to observe the human rights and freedoms guaranteed by the USSR Constitution.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev

[Dated] Moscow, the Kremlin, 4 July 1991

Kazakhstan

Two Nuclear Tests on Semipalatinsk Schedule

LD0707084591 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Jul 91

[Text] Kazakh President Nazarbayev has stated that the nuclear site in the town of Semipalatinsk will be closed down before the end of this year. Until then, two nuclear tests will be carried out there. But these will be the last weapons tests in this southern republic.

Semipalatinsk Facility To Close at Year's End

LD0607123191 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Jul 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The nuclear testing ground in Semipalatinsk will be closed down at the end of the year, Kazakh President Nazarbayev has stated.

Uzbekistan

Trade Unions, Government Reach Agreement

LD0607175491 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT
6 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Irina Grebenyuk]

[Text] Tashkent July 6 TASS—An agreement reached by the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan and the Trade Union Federation Council of this Central Asian republic includes a package of measures, aimed at providing social protection to the population during the difficult period of the transition to a market-based system.

A sharp growth of the prices of food and essentials affected the living standards of the republic's population. The transition to the market-based system will make even more acute the already serious unemployment problem. There are about one million unemployed people in Uzbekistan.

A programme of joint actions of trade unions and the republican government is expected to alleviate the situation and put it under control. The two sides are going to implement jointly the indexation of incomes, to determine the minimal subsistence wage in Uzbekistan and on this basis to carry out a radical reform of the wage system. They intend to work out and put into effect the republican employment programme. It will include measures, aimed at preserving and increasing the number of jobs, ensuring a rational distribution of productive forces and encouraging the development of small enterprises. Various forms of ownership will coexist on equal terms for the first time in Uzbekistan. Besides, the fund for promoting employment is being created in the republic.

The agreement between the government and trade unions of Uzbekistan devotes special attention to the social protection of people living in the ecological disaster zones, primarily the Aral region with a population of about three million. It is planned to build a number of medical institutions by joint effort and grant some privileges to residents of the region for their medical treatment and recreation.

Special items of the agreement deal with labour protection measures.

Turkmenistan

Agricultural Emergency Assistance Sought

LD0807040891 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA
in Russian 4 Jun 91 p 1

[Message from S. Niyazov, president of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic to V.S. Pavlov, USSR prime minister, "on the emergency in agriculture in the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic"; date not given]

[Text] Esteemed Valentin Sergeyevich! Heavy rain, mountain torrents, and floods in April and the first 10 days of May have led to an emergency for the republic's agriculture. The sowing campaign is between 10 and 12 days behind the optimum agrotechnical schedule. Furthermore, around 80,000 hectares of cotton and other agricultural crops had to be resown between 1 and 15 May.

The situation took a sharp turn for the worse between 17 and 21 May when there was more heavy rainfall with strong winds and hail. In some places the hailstones measured 45 mm and weighed 120 grams.

The result was the complete destruction of over 100,000 hectares of cotton, 11,000 hectares of vegetables, and 19,000 hectares of other crops. Great damage was done to winter grain crops, alfalfa, fruit, and vineyards.

The strong wind damaged over 15,000 residential buildings; 450 schools, preschools, and medical establishments; and 800 livestock and other production installations.

According to preliminary calculations the overall damage is more than 200 million rubles.

The resulting emergency may lead to a sharp fall in the volume of production of raw cotton and food. This entails a risk of reduction in the standard of living of people in the countryside and of a deterioration in the food supply to the entire population of the republic, as well as a reduction in the amounts supplied to all-union stocks.

The government of the republic and the executive committees of soviets of people's deputies are implementing a range of organizational and economic measures to

eliminate the consequences of the disaster. However, the republic needs help from all-union bodies.

I ask you, Valentin Sergeyevich, to examine and resolve the issue of allocating 150 million rubles to the republic from the union budget for the elimination of the consequences of the disaster, as well as the following resources: 30,000 tonnes of diesel fuel; 12,000 tonnes of gasoline; 12,000 tonnes of diesel oil; 25,000 tonnes of nitrogen

fertilizer; 15,000 tonnes of phosphorous fertilizer; 75,000 cubic meters of saw-timber; 20,000 tonnes of cement; 12,000 tonnes of slate; 80,000 sq meters of glass; 5,500 tonnes of rolled metal; 7,000 sq meters of plywood; 250 tonnes of (uninsulated) aluminum wire; and fully equipped 20,000 kv transformer substations.

With respect, S. Niyazov, president of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic.